arXiv:1704.07210v1 [math.CA] 24 Apr 2017

An improved bound on the Hausdorff dimension of Besicovitch sets in $\mathbb{R}^3$

Nets Hawk Katz[*] Joshua Zahl[†]

April 25, 2017

Abstract

We prove that any Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ must have Hausdorff dimension at least $5/2 + \epsilon_0$ for some small constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$. This follows from a more general result about the volume of unions of tubes that satisfy the Wolff axioms. Our proof grapples with a new "almost counter example" to the Kakeya conjecture, which we call the SL_2 example; this object resembles a Besicovitch set that has Minkowski dimension 3 but Hausdorff dimension 5/2. We believe this example may be an interesting object for future study.

1 Introduction

A Besicovitch set is a compact set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ that contains a unit line segment pointing in every direction. In this paper, we will prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Every Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ has Hausdorff dimension at least $5/2+\epsilon_0$, where $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is a small absolute constant.*

Theorem 1.1 is a small improvement over a previous result of Wolff [17], who proved a version of Theorem 1.1 with $\epsilon_0 = 0$. Katz, Łaba, and Tao [12] also proved a version of Theorem 1.1 where "Hausdorff dimension" was replaced by upper Minkowski dimension[1]. These results and related work will be discussed further in Section 1.1.

Given a number $0 < \delta < 1$, we say a set $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a δ–tube (or just a tube) if $\mathcal{T}$ is the δ–neighborhood of a unit line segment.

Definition 1.1. *We say that a set $\mathbb{T}$ of tubes satisfies the Wolff axioms if:*

- *Each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ is contained in the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$.*
- *If $\delta \leq s, t \leq 1$, then at most $st\delta^{-2}$ tubes from $\mathbb{T}$ are contained in any rectangular prism of dimensions $2 \times s \times t$ (the prism need not be aligned with the coordinate axes).*

Note that the second condition implies that $|\mathbb{T}| \lesssim \delta^{-2}$. Theorem 1.1 is a corollary of the following result.

[*]California Institute of Technology, Pasadena CA, supported by NSF grants DMS 1266104 and DMS 1565904

[†]University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC

[1]We do not know whether the constant ε_0 in Theorem 1.1 is larger or smaller than the corresponding constant in [12]

Theorem 1.2. *There exist positive constants C (large) and $c > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ (small) so that the following holds. Let $\delta > 0$, $\delta \le \lambda \le 1$, and let $\mathbb{T}$ be a set of tubes that satisfy the Wolff axioms. For each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, let $Y(\mathcal{T}) \subset \mathcal{T}$ and suppose that $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \ge \lambda$. Then*

$$\Big| \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T}) \Big| \ge c\lambda^C \delta^{1/2-\varepsilon_0}. \tag{1.1}$$

1.1 Previous work

It is conjectured that every Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ must have Hausdorff dimension n. The case $n = 2$ was solved (in the affirmative) by Davies [6]. For $n \ge 3$, the problem remains open. We will only discuss progress on this conjecture in $\mathbb{R}^3$. A broader and more detailed survey can be found in the survey articles by Wolff [19] and by Katz-Tao [14].

There are now a number of (non-equivalent) conjectures that all fall under the umbrella of the "Kakeya conjecture." For a given number $0 < d \le 3$, each of the estimates below implies the estimates preceding it.

- **Upper Minkowski dimension estimate:** Any Besicovitch set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ must have upper Minkowski dimension at least d.
- **Lower Minkowski dimension estimate:** Any Besicovitch set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ must have lower Minkowski dimension at least d.
- **Hausdorff dimension estimate:** Any Besicovitch set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ must have Hausdorff dimension at least d.
- **Maximal function estimate:** Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a set of direction-separated δ-tubes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so that

$$\Big\| \sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} \chi_{\mathcal{T}} \Big\|_{d'} \le C_\epsilon \delta^{1-3/d-\epsilon}. \tag{1.2}$$

- **X-ray estimate:** There is a $\beta > 0$ with the following property. Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a set of δ–tubes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Suppose that no tube is contained in the two-fold dilate of any other tube. Suppose furthermore that for each direction $e \in S^2$, at most m tubes point in a direction that is δ–close to e. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so that

$$\Big\| \sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} \chi_{\mathcal{T}} \Big\|_{d'} \le C_\epsilon \delta^{1-3/d-\epsilon} m^{1-\beta}. \tag{1.3}$$

The Kakeya conjecture in $\mathbb{R}^3$ asserts that all of the above estimates hold with $d = 3$. We will say that a Minkowski dimension, Hausdorff dimension, etc. estimate holds in dimension d if the corresponding statement above has been established. Davies's estimate [6] immediately implies that any Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ must have Hausdorff dimension at least 2. A more elaborate argument by Cordoba established a maximal function estimate in dimension $d = 2$.

In [3], Bourgain showed that every Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ has Hausdorff dimension at least $d = 7/3$. In [17], Wolff established a maximal function estimate in dimension $d = 5/2$, and then in [18] Wolff established a X-ray estimate in dimension $d = 5/2$.

As we will discuss further in Section 1.2, establishing Kakeya estimates above dimension $d = 5/2$ is difficult because there are sets that closely resemble Besicovitch sets, but which have dimension

5/2. Thus any proof of a Kakeya estimate above dimension $d = 5/2$ must grapple with these examples.

In [12], Katz, Łaba, and Tao proved that every Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ must have upper Minkowski dimension at least $5/2+\epsilon_0$ for a small constant ϵ_0. To do this, they extensively studied the structure of a (hypothetical) Besicovitch set with upper Minkowski dimension near 5/2. They showed that such a Besicovitch set must have several properties, which they called "planiness," "graininess," and "stickiness." In brief, planiness asserts that the tubes in a Besicovitch set passing through a typical point lie in a small neighborhood of a plane. Graininess asserts that as one moves the point in question, the corresponding planes change in a controlled way. Finally, stickiness asserts that if $\mathbb{T}$ is a set of direction-separated δ–tubes whose union is a Besicovitch set with small volume, then the map $E\colon S^2 \to \mathbb{T}$ which sends a direction $e \in S^2$ to the corresponding tube in $\mathbb{T}$ satisfies a weak Lipschitz-continuity type property.

After Katz, Łaba, and Tao's result, a natural question arises: are the properties planiness, graininess, and stickiness fundamental to Besicovitch sets, or are they artifacts of the proof techniques used in [12]? In [1], Bennett, Carbery, and Tao established the multilinear Kakeya theorem. One of the implications of this theorem is that any Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with dimension less than n must be plany. In [9], Guth showed that any Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with dimension less than 3 must be grainy and similar ideas can be used to establish graininess-like properties in higher dimensions. Thus the properties of planiness and graininess are not merely artifacts of the Katz-Łaba-Tao proof; they are fundamental features of (hypothetical) Besicovitch sets that violate the Kakeya conjecture.

What about stickiness? It is not known whether every Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (or $\mathbb{R}^3$) with dimension less than n must be sticky. In a blog post [15], Tao gave a heuristic argument why a sticky Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with minimal dimension strictly less than 3 is impossible. Thus if one could show that every Besicovitch set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with dimension less than three must be sticky, then this would be a promising step towards resolving the Kakeya conjecture in $\mathbb{R}^3$. However, in proving Theorem 1.2 we are forced to deal with an object that resembles a non-sticky Besicovitch set. Informally, this means that unlike being plany and grainy, Besicovitch sets in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with dimension less than three do not need to be sticky[2].

1.2 Enemies old and new

1.2.1 The Heisenberg group

One of the reasons that it is difficult to strengthen Wolff's result from [17] is that the Heisenberg group is an "almost counter-example" to the Kakeya conjecture. the Heisenberg group is the set

$$\mathbb{H} = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3\colon \operatorname{Im}(z) = \operatorname{Im}(x\bar{y})\}. \tag{1.4}$$

$\mathbb{H}$ shares many properties in common with a Besicovitch set. It is a subset of $\mathbb{C}^3$ rather than $\mathbb{R}^3$, but it contains a two (complex) dimensional family of lines. Indeed, for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}$, the complex line

$$L_{a,b,w} = \{(s, w + as, s\bar{w} + b)\colon s \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

is contained in $\mathbb{H}$. Furthermore, if we restrict our attention to $\mathbb{H} \cap B(0, 1)$ and cover each point of $\mathbb{H} \cap B(0, 1)$ by a ball of radius δ, we obtain a set of complex δ–tubes (the intersection of a unit ball with the δ–neighborhood of a complex line in $\mathbb{C}^3$), and these tubes satisfy the natural analogue of the Wolff axioms.

[2]Of course if the Kakeya conjecture is true then Besicovitch sets in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with dimension less than three do not exist. Another interpretation of our result is that in order to prove the Kakeya conjecture in $\mathbb{R}^3$, it will likely not be possible to first prove that every Besicovitch set of dimension less than three is sticky.

However, the Heisenberg group differs from a genuine Besicovitch set in two key respects. First, while the Heisenberg group contains a two (complex) dimensional family of lines that satisfy a natural analogue of the Wolff axioms, these lines do not all point in different directions. Instead, there is a 3/2–dimensional family of directions, and there is a half dimensional family of lines pointing in each of these directions. In [12], Katz, Łaba, and Tao exploit the fact that the tubes in a Besicovitch set all point in different directions to obtain their improved estimate; this is how their proof distinguishes between the Heisenberg group and a genuine Besicovitch set.

The second difference between the Heisenberg group and a genuine Besicovitch set is that the Heisenberg group is a subset of $\mathbb{C}^3$, while a Besicovitch set is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^3$. This distinction is crucial. Observe from (1.4) that the definition of $\mathbb{H}$ makes use of the complex conjugation map $z \mapsto \bar{z}$, and the existence of this map is closely related to the fact that $\mathbb{C}$ contains a half-dimensional subfield. $\mathbb{R}$, however does not contain a half-dimensional subfield. This observation (or rather a quantitative version of it) is a key component of the proof of Theorem 1.2; this is how our proof distinguishes between the Heisenberg group and a genuine Besicovitch set.

1.2.2 The SL_2 example

In proving Theorem 1.2 we encountered a new difficulty that has not appeared before. We call this problem the SL_2 example. The SL_2 example is a (hypothetical) set of δ^{-2} tubes that satisfy the Wolff axioms. The union of these tubes has volume $\delta^{1/2}$, but the union of the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhoods of these tubes has volume ~ 1. Thus the SL_2 example is an almost counter-example to the Hausdorff version of the Kakeya conjecture in $\mathbb{R}^3$, but it is not an almost counter-example to the upper Minkowski dimension version of the conjecture. Furthermore, the SL_2 example is not sticky, in the sense described in Section 1.1 above.

Of course, Theorem 1.2 asserts that the SL_2 example cannot actually exist in $\mathbb{R}^3$. However, it is possible to construct the SL_2 example in a slightly different setting. Let R be the ring $\mathbb{F}_p[t]/(t^2)$. Each number $x \in [0,1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ can be written as $x = \delta^{1/2}x_1 + \delta x_2 + O(\delta)$, where x_1 and x_2 are integers between 0 and $\lfloor \delta^{-1/2} \rfloor$. The ring R is meant to model this decomposition of the interval $[0,1]$. Elements of $\mathbb{F}_p \subset \mathbb{F}_p[t]/(t^2)$ represent the coarse (i.e. $\delta^{1/2}$) scale, while elements of $t \cdot \mathbb{F}_p$ represent the fine (i.e. δ) scale.

Define

$$X = \{(x_1 + x_2 t,\ y_1 + y_2 t,\ z_1 + z_2 t) \in R^3 \colon z_2 = x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1\}. \tag{1.5}$$

We have that $|X| = p^5 = |R|^{5/2}$. Observe that the definition of X looks nearly identical to the definition of $\mathbb{H}$ from (1.4). However, since the rings $\mathbb{C}$ and R have dramatically different properties, the resulting sets $\mathbb{H}$ and X will differ markedly as well.

We will consider subsets of R^3 of the form $\{(a,b,0) + s(c,d,1) \colon s \in R\}$, where $a,b,c,d \in R$. These are the analogue of lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that are not parallel to the xy plane. Each of these "lines" can be identified with a point in R^4.

Define

$$\mathcal{L} = \{(a + \alpha a t,\ b + \alpha b t,\ c + \alpha c t,\ d + \alpha d t) \in R^4 \colon a,b,c,d,\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p,\ ad - bc = 1\}.$$

$\mathcal{L}$ is a set of $p^4 = |M|^2$ lines, each of which is contained in X. The lines in $\mathcal{L}$ satisfy an analogue of the Wolff axioms. However, the lines in $\mathcal{L}$ are not "sticky," and the analogue of the upper (and lower) Minkowski dimension of X is large: if $\pi \colon R^3 \to \mathbb{F}_p^3$ is the projection $(x_1 + x_2 t, y_1 + y_2 t, z_1 + z_2 t) \mapsto (x_1, y_1, z_1)$, then

$$\pi(X) = \mathbb{F}_p^3. \tag{1.6}$$

If the SL_2 example were defined over $\mathbb{R}^3$ rather than R^3, then (1.6) says that the $\delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of the union of lines in the SL_2 example has volume approximately one. This is dramatically different from the Heisenberg group example, in which the union would have volume approximately $\delta^{1/4}$. The SL_2 example will be discussed further in Appendix A.

The ring R has an ideal $t\mathbb{F}_p \subset R$ of nilpotent elements, and this ideal plays a crucial role in the construction of the SL_2 example. The reals do not contain such an ideal, and this fact is (implicitly) exploited when showing no analogue of the SL_2 example can exist in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

1.2.3 The Regulus map

To prove Theorem 1.2, we will show that any hypothetical counter-example to the theorem must resemble either the Heisenberg or SL_2 examples described above. To do this, we will consider an object called the "regulus map," (defined in Section 3.4), which describes how much algebraic structure the counter-example possesses at coarse scales. At one extreme is the SL_2 example: at coarse scales, the tubes in the SL_2 example lie close to an algebraic variety in the parameter space of lines (namely $\{(a,b,c,d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \colon ad - bc = 1\}$). At the opposite extreme is the Heisenberg example: at coarse scales (indeed at all scales), few tubes in the Heisenberg example lie close to any low degree algebraic variety in the parameter space of lines.

Unfortunately, a hypothetical counter-example to Theorem 1.2 may lie anywhere between these two extremes. Quantifying this intermediate behavior is one of the major technical difficulties we encounter in this paper.

1.3 Notation and and epsilon management

Throughout this paper, δ will denote a small positive number. Unless noted otherwise, all constants will be independent of δ.

The goal of this paper is to prove Theorem 1.2 for some absolute constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. To do this, we will prove a series of statements that all depend on a small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. Eventually we will show that if ε is sufficiently small then we arrive at a contradiction. Thus the variable ε will denote a small positive number (whose meaning may differ in different statements) that is always larger than some absolute constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ that will be determined at the end of the paper. In particular, it will always be the case that $\delta^{\varepsilon} \leq \delta^{\varepsilon_0} \leq c|\log \delta|^{-1}$ for some absolute constant $c > 0$.

We write $A \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} B$ to mean that there exists a constant C (independent of δ) so that $A \leq \delta^{-C\varepsilon} B$. The constant C may vary from line to line. If $A \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} B$ and $B \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} A$, then we write $A \approx_{\varepsilon} B$.

To avoid keeping track of many different constants, we will often use the following sort of notation:
Lemma A: Suppose that $P \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} Q$. Then $R \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} S$.
Lemma B: Suppose that $R \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} S$. Then $T \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} V$.

By combining Lemmas A and B, we conclude that if $P \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} Q$ then $T \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} V$. This is because Lemma A asserts that $P \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} Q$ implies $R \leq \delta^{-C_1\varepsilon} S$ for some constant C_1, while Lemma B (with ε replaced by $C_1\varepsilon$) asserts that $R \leq \delta^{-C_1\varepsilon} S$ implies $T \leq \delta^{-C_2 C_1 \varepsilon} V$ for some constant C_2. The latter statement is equivalent to $T \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} V$. In future, we will chain together multiple lemmas that use $\lessapprox_{\varepsilon}$ notation without further comment.

If A is a set and $t > 0$, we will use $N_t(A)$ to denote the t-neighborhood of A. For example, the statement "$B \subset N_{\lessapprox_{\varepsilon} t} A$" means: there exists an absolute constant C so that the set B is contained in the $\delta^{-C\varepsilon} t$-neighborhood of the set A.

2 Reguli

It is a well-known result (see e.g. [11]) that the union of the set of lines intersecting three skew lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ forms a regulus (a doubly-ruled quadric surface). Reguli play a central role when studying the structure of Besicovitch sets near dimension 5/2. In the next section, we will develop various quantitative statements about set of tubes.

2.1 Quantitative skewness

Definition 2.1 (Linear cone)**.** *Let L be a line in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and let Π be a plane containing L. A* linear cone *of angle α with vertex L is a set of the form*

$$\{p \in \mathbb{R}^3 \colon \operatorname{dist}(p, \Pi) \leq \alpha \operatorname{dist}(\pi(p), L)\},$$

where $\pi(p)$ is the orthogonal projection of p to Π. For example, if $L = (0,0,0) + \mathbb{R}(1,0,0)$ and Π is the plane $\{y = 0\}$, then the above set is given by $\{(x,y,z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \colon |z| \leq \alpha |y|\}$.

Definition 2.2 (Quantitative skewness)**.** *Let L_1 and L_2 be two lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that intersect the unit ball. We define $\operatorname{skew}(L_1, L_2)$ to be the minimum value of α so that $L_2 \cap B(0,2)$ is contained in a linear cone of angle α with vertex L_1. We say that L_1 and L_2 are $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ skew if $\operatorname{skew}(L_1, L_2) \geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$, and we say that L_1 and L_2 are $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ skew if $\operatorname{skew}(L_1, L_2) \approx_{\varepsilon} 1$.*

Definition 2.3 (Quantitative separation)**.** *Let L_1, L_2 be two lines that intersect the unit ball. We say that L_1, L_2 are t separated (with error δ^{ε}) if*

$$\delta^{\varepsilon} t \leq \operatorname{dist}(p, L_2) \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} t \quad \text{for all } p \in L_1 \cap B(0,1). \tag{2.1}$$

We say that L_1 and L_2 are t separated (with error $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$) if

$$\operatorname{dist}(p, L_2) \approx_{\varepsilon} t \quad \text{for all } p \in L_1 \cap B(0,1). \tag{2.2}$$

Note that if L_1, L_2 are t separated with error δ^{ε}, then $t \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon} \operatorname{skew}(L_1, L_2)$. We say that L_1 and L_2 are uniformly separated with error δ^{ε} (resp. $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$) if they are t separated with error δ^{ε} (resp. $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$) for some value of t.

For brevity, we will say that two lines are $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ separated and skew if they are $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ skew and 1 separated with error δ^{ε}. We will say that two lines are $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ separated and skew if they are $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ skew and 1 separated with error $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$.

If $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are tubes, we define the skew (resp. separation) of $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ to be the skew (resp. separation) of their coaxial lines.

2.2 Reguli and curvature

In this section we will prove quantitative bounds on the Gauss curvature of reguli defined by certain triples of lines.

Lemma 2.1. *Let L, L_1 and L_2 be lines. Suppose that L makes an angle $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ with L_1 and L_2, and that L intersects L_1 and L_2 inside the unit ball. Let Π_i be the plane spanned by L and L_i. Suppose that*

$$\delta^{\varepsilon} \angle(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) \leq \operatorname{dist}(L \cap L_1,\ L \cap L_2) \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} \angle(\Pi_1, \Pi_2),$$

and

$$\delta^{\varepsilon} \angle(L_1, L_2) \leq \operatorname{dist}(L \cap L_1,\ L \cap L_2) \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} \angle(L_1, L_2).$$

Then L_1 and L_2 are $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ skew and are uniformly separated with error $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let L_1 and L_2 be lines that intersect the unit ball. Suppose that L_1 and L_2 are uniformly separated with error δ^ε and are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ skew. For each $p \in L_1 \cap B(0,1)$, let Π_p be the plane spanned by p and L_2. Let $p_0 \in L_1 \cap B(0,1)$, and define the function*

$$f\colon L_1 \cap B(0,1) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad p \mapsto \angle(\Pi_{p_0}, \Pi_x),$$

where $\angle(\Pi_{p_0}, \Pi_x)$ denotes the signed angle between Π_{p_0} and Π_x.

Then f is continuously differentiable and has derivative $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ for all $p \in L_1 \cap B(0,1)$. In particular,

$$\angle(\Pi_{p_1}, \Pi_{p_2}) \approx_\varepsilon \operatorname{dist}(p_1, p_2) \tag{2.3}$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in L_1 \cap B(0,1)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let L_1 and L_2 be lines that intersect the unit ball. Suppose they are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew. Let L_1^* and L_2^* intersect L_1 and L_2 inside the unit ball. Suppose*

$$\delta^\varepsilon \operatorname{dist}(L_2 \cap L_1^*,\ L_2 \cap L_2^*) \leq \operatorname{dist}(L_1 \cap L_1^*,\ L_1 \cap L_2^*) \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon} \operatorname{dist}(L_2 \cap L_1^*,\ L_2 \cap L_2^*).$$

Then L_1^* and L_2^* are uniformly separated with error $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew. Furthermore, $\angle(L_i, L_j^*) \approx_\varepsilon 1$ for each pair i, j.

Proof. Note that since L_1 and L_2 are 1 separated with error δ^ε, both L_1^* and L_2^* must make an angle $\gtrapprox_\epsilon 1$ with each of L_1 and L_2. Let $t = \operatorname{dist}(L_1 \cap L_1^*,\ L_1 \cap L_2^*)$. Let Π_1 be the plane spanned by L_1^* and L_2, and let Π_2 be the plane spanned by L_2^* and L_2. By Lemma 2.2, $\angle(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) \approx_\varepsilon t$. Thus $\angle(L_1^*,\ L_2^*) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon t$. On the other hand, since L_1 and L_2 are 1 separated with error δ^ε, we have $\operatorname{dist}(L_1 \cap L_1^*,\ L_1 \cap L_2^*) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$, $\operatorname{dist}(L_1 \cap L_1^*,\ L_2) \approx_\varepsilon t$, and $\operatorname{dist}(L_1 \cap L_2^*,\ L_2) \approx_\varepsilon t$, so $\angle(L_1^*,\ L_2^*) \lessapprox_\varepsilon t$. Thus $\angle(L_1^*,\ L_2^*) \approx_\varepsilon t$.

Thus

$$\angle(L_1^*, L_2^*) \approx_\varepsilon \angle(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) \approx_\varepsilon \operatorname{dist}(L_1^* \cap L_2,\ L_2^* \cap L_2),$$

so by Lemma 2.1, L_1^* and L_2^* are $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew and are uniformly separated with error $\approx_\varepsilon 1$. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let L_1, L_2, and L_3 be three lines that intersect the unit ball. Suppose that all three lines are pairwise $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ skew; L_1, L_2 are uniformly separated with error δ^ε; and L_1, L_3 and L_2, L_3 are 1 separated with error δ^ε.*

Let L_1^* and L_2^* intersect each of L_1, L_2, and L_3 inside the unit ball. Then L_1^* and L_2^* are uniformly separated with error $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew. Furthermore, $\angle(L_1, L_1^*) \approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $\angle(L_1, L_2^*) \approx_\varepsilon 1$.

Proof. Let $p_i = L_i^* \cap L_1,\ i = 1, 2$ and let $t = \operatorname{dist}(p_1, p_2)$. For each $p \in L_1$, let Π_p be the plane spanned by p and L_2. Since L_2 and L_3 are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew, we have that for each $p \in B(0,1) \cap L_1$, $\angle(\Pi_p,\ L_3) \approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $\operatorname{dist}(0,\ \Pi_p \cap L_3) \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$.

By Lemma 2.2, we have $\angle(\Pi_{p_1},\ \Pi_{p_2}) \approx_\varepsilon t$. Observe as well that since L_2 and L_3 are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew, for $p \in L_1$ we have,

$$\operatorname{dist}(\Pi_{p_1} \cap L_3,\ \Pi_p \cap L_3) \approx_\varepsilon \angle(\Pi_{p_1}, \Pi_p).$$

In particular, this means $\operatorname{dist}(\Pi_{p_1} \cap L_3,\ \Pi_{p_2} \cap L_3) \approx_\varepsilon t$. Since $\Pi_{p_i} \cap L_3$ lies on $L_i^*,\ i = 1, 2$, we can apply Lemma 2.3 to L_1, L_3, L_1^*, L_2^* to conclude that L_1^* and L_2^* are uniformly separated with error $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew, and that $\angle(L_1, L_1^*) \approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $\angle(L_1, L_2^*) \approx_\varepsilon 1$. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let L_1, L_2, and L_3 be three lines that intersect the unit ball. Suppose that all three lines are pairwise $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ skew; L_1, L_2 are uniformly separated with error δ^ε; and L_1, L_3 and L_2, L_3 are 1 separated with error δ^ε.*

Let R be the regulus containing L_1, L_2, and L_3. Then for any $p \in R \cap B(0,1)$, there are lines L_1^*, L_2^*, L_3^* and L with the following properties

- *L_1^*, L_2^*, L_3^*, and L are contained in R.*
- *L intersects each of L_1^*, L_2^*, and L_3^*, and the points of intersection occur in $B(0, \delta^{-C\varepsilon})$, where C is an absolute constant.*
- *$L \cap L_1^* = p$.*
- *$\angle(L, L_1^*) \approx_\varepsilon 1$.*
- *L_1^*, L_2^*, and L_3^* are pairwise $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew.*

Proof. Let L_1^* be the unique line passing through p that is incident to L_1, L_2, and L_3. Select L_2^* and L_3^* to be any two lines incident to L_1, L_2, and L_3 with $\operatorname{dist}(L_i^* \cap L_1, L_j^* \cap L_1) \approx_\varepsilon 1$ for each pair i, j. Apply Lemma 2.4 to each of the pairs L_1^*, L_2^*; L_1^*, L_3^*; and L_2^*, L_3^*. Select L to be the unique line passing through p that is incident to L_1^*, L_2^*, and L_3^*. The proof that $\angle(L_1^*, L) \approx_\varepsilon 1$ is the same as that in Lemma 2.3 (applied to L_1^* and L_3^*). □

Lemma 2.6. *Let L_1, L_2, and L_3 be three lines that intersect the unit ball. Suppose that all three lines are pairwise $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew. Suppose as well that $\angle(L_1, L_2) \leq 1/10$, $\angle(L_1, L_3) \leq 1/10$.*

Let L be a line intersecting each of L_1, L_2, and L_3, and suppose $\angle(L, L_i) \geq \delta^\varepsilon$. Let R be the regulus containing L_1, L_2, and L_3 and let $p = L_1 \cap L$. Then the Gauss curvature of R at p satisfies

$$|K_p| \approx_\varepsilon 1. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. After applying a rigid transformation, we can assume that L_1 is the z axis, p is the origin, and T_pR is the yz plane. Let $\theta = \angle(L_1^*, L)$, so $L = (0, u\sin\theta, u\cos\theta)$. Then the lines L_1^*, L_2^*, L_3^* have the form

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &: \ (0,0,0) + \mathbb{R}(0,0,1), \\ L_2 &: \ (0, u_1\sin\theta, u_1\cos\theta) + \mathbb{R}(v_1, v_2, v_3), \\ L_3 &: \ (0, u_2\sin\theta, u_2\cos\theta) + \mathbb{R}(w_1, w_2, w_3). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

We will call these three lines the "generators" of the regulus.

Next, we will calculate the function $\big(y_1(s), y_2(s), y_3(s)\big)$ so that the line through $(0,0,s)$ in the direction $\big(y_1(s), y_2(s), y_3(s)\big)$ intersects the second and third generators, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \big(y_1(s), y_2(s), y_3(s)\big) &\in \operatorname{span}\Big((0, u_1\sin\theta, u_1\cos\theta - s),\ (v_1, v_2, v_3)\Big), \\ \big(y_1(s), y_2(s), y_3(s)\big) &\in \operatorname{span}\Big((0, u_2\sin\theta, u_2\cos\theta - s),\ (w_1, w_2, w_3)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$(y_1, y_2, y_3) = \Big((0,\ u_1\sin\theta,\ u_1\cos\theta - s) \times (v_1, v_2, v_3)\Big) \times \Big(0,\ u_2\sin\theta,\ u_2\cos\theta - s) \times (w_1, w_2, w_3)\Big).$$

The Gauss curvature at the origin is given by

$$K = -\frac{(y_1'(0))^2}{(y_2(0))^2}.$$

This is because we can parameterize the surface as

$$r(s,t) = (0,0,s) + t\big(y_1(s),\ y_2(s),\ y_3(s)\big).$$

The Gauss curvature at the origin is then given by

$$K = \frac{LN - M^2}{EG - F^2},$$

where (E,F,G) is the first fundamental form, and (L,M,N) is the second fundamental form, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} L &= r_{ss} \cdot n, \\ M &= r_{st} \cdot n, \\ N &= r_{tt} \cdot n, \end{aligned}$$

where n is the normal vector of R at the origin.

At the origin, $s = t = 0$, so we have $r_{ss} = r_{tt} = 0$, and $r_{st} = \big(y_1'(0), y_2'(0), y_3'(0)\big)$. Since $n = (1,0,0)$, we have $M = y_1'(0)$. Similarly $E = 1$, $G = (y_1(0))^2 + (y_2(0))^2 + (y_3(0))^2$ and $F = y_3(0)$, but since $y(0)$ is in the direction $(0, \sin\theta, \cos\theta)$ we have that $y_1(0) = 0$.

Each of the lines L_1, L_2, and L_3 from (2.5) can be written in the form $L_i = (a_i, b_i, 0) + \mathbb{R}(c_i, d_i, 1)$. Define

$$X_{ij} = \begin{vmatrix} a_i - a_j & b_i - b_j \\ c_i - c_j & d_i - d_j \end{vmatrix}.$$

Observe that $|X_{ij}|$ is six times the volume of the tetrahedron spanned by the points $(a_i, b_i, 0)$, $(a_i + c_i, b_i + d_i, 1)$, $(a_j, b_j, 0)$, $(a_j + c_j, b_j + d_j, 1)$. Since L_i and L_j are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew,

$$|X_{ij}| \approx_\varepsilon 1. \tag{2.6}$$

The values of (a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i) associated to the lines L_1, L_2, and L_3 are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &: \ \big(0,\ 0,\ 0,\ 0\big), \\ L_2 &: \ \big(-(v_1/v_3)u_1\cos\theta,\ u_1\sin\theta - (v_2/v_3)u_1\cos\theta,\ v_1/v_3,\ v_2/v_3\big), \\ L_3 &: \ \big(-(w_1/w_3)u_2\cos\theta,\ u_1\sin\theta - (w_2/w_3)u_2\cos\theta,\ w_1/w_3,\ w_2/w_3\big). \end{aligned}$$

The matrix determinants X_{ij} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_{12} &= (u_1 v_1/v_3)\sin\theta, \\ X_{13} &= (u_2 w_1/w_3)\sin\theta, \\ X_{23} &= (u_1 - u_2)(v_3 w_1 \sin\theta - v_2 w_1 \cos\theta - v_1 w_3 \sin\theta + v_1 w_2 \cos\theta)/v_3 w_3. \end{aligned}$$

A computation shows that

$$K^{1/2} X_{12} X_{13} X_{23} = (u_1 - u_2)^2 v_1^2 w_1^2 \sin^2\theta/(v_3^2 w_3^2).$$

As noted above, $|X_{ij}| \approx_\varepsilon 1$ whenever $i \neq j$. Since L_2 and L_3 are 1 separated with error δ^ε, $(u_1 - u_2) \approx_\varepsilon 1$. Since $\angle(L_1, L_2) \leq 1/10$, we have $v_3 \sim 1$ and similarly $w_3 \sim 1$.

We will now show that $v_1 \approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $w_1 \approx_\varepsilon 1$. Select another line L^* that is incident to L_1, L_2, and L_3 and is $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew to L (Lemma 2.4 guarantees that this is possible). Since L lies in the yz plane, we must have that L^* makes an angle $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ with the yz plane. Furthermore, L_2 and L_3 intersect L^* at locations that have distance $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ from the origin, and thus the x–coordinate of these intersections has magnitude $\approx_\varepsilon 1$. Since the x coordinate of $L_2 \cap L$ and $L_3 \cap L$ is 0, we conclude that $v_1 \approx_\varepsilon 1$ and $w_1 \approx_\varepsilon 1$. Thus we conclude that $|K| \approx_\varepsilon 1$, which establishes (2.4). $\square$

Lemma 2.7. *Let L_1, L_2, and L_3 be three lines that intersect the unit ball. Suppose that all three lines are pairwise $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ skew; L_1, L_2 are uniformly separated with error δ^{ε}; and L_1, L_3 and L_2, L_3 are 1 separated with error δ^{ε}.*

Let R be the regulus containing L_1, L_2, and L_3. Then for all $p \in R \cap B(0,1)$, we have the bound

$$|K_p| \approx_{\varepsilon} 1.$$

Proof. Apply Lemma 2.5 and then Lemma 2.6. □

2.3 Quantitatively non-degenerate reguli

A regulus in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is specified by nine parameters, and set of tubes can degenerate in many different ways as these parameters vary. A particularly subtle example is the following. As discussed at the beginning of Section 2, a regulus can be expressed as the union of all lines that intersect three skew lines L_1, L_2, and L_3. If L_1, L_2, and L_3 are all parallel to a common plane, then the regulus is called a hyperbolic paraboloid. Otherwise, the regulus is called a hyperboloid. We will generally work with the latter type of regulus. Since we require quantitative estimates about set of tubes, we will sometimes need to quantify the extent to which a regulus resembles a hyperboloid.

Lemma 2.8. *Let L_1, L_2, and L_3 be three tubes that intersect the unit ball. Suppose that L_1, L_2, and L_3 are $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ separated and skew. Suppose furthermore that L_3 makes an angle $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ with the plane spanned by the vectors $v(L_1)$ and $v(L_2)$ (i.e. L_1, L_2 and L_3 are far from being parallel to a common plane, and thus the regulus generated by L_1, L_2, and L_3 is far from being a hyperbolic paraboloid). Then there is a monic degree-two polynomial Q that vanishes on L_1, L_2, and L_3 that satisfies $|\nabla Q| \approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ on $Z(Q) \cap B(0,1)$.*

Proof. We will describe an affine transformation $T\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ that sends L_1, L_2, and L_3 to the lines $L_1^* = \mathbb{R}(1,0,0)$, $L_2^* = (0,1,0) + \mathbb{R}(0,0,1)$, and $L_3^* = (1,0,1) + \mathbb{R}(0,1,0)$, respectively. This affine transformation is of the form $T(x) = Ax + b$, where the entries of A have magnitude $\lessapprox_{\varepsilon} 1$, the determinant of A has magnitude $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$, and $|b| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} 1$.

There is an explicit degree-two polynomial Q_0 that vanishes on L_1^*, L_2^* and L_3^* and that satisfies $|\nabla Q| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon} 1$ on $B(0, \delta^{-C\varepsilon})$, where the implicit constant in the $\lessapprox_{\varepsilon}$ notation depends on the constant C. Thus the pull-back of Q_0 by T is a degree-two polynomial whose largest coefficient has magnitude $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ and whose gradient has magnitude $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ on the unit ball. Multiplying this polynomial by a constant of magnitude $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$, we obtain the desired monic polynomial. In the remainder of this proof we will describe the affine transformation T in greater detail.

Applying a rotation and a translation of the form $(x,y,z) \mapsto (x,y,z) + w$ with $|w| \sim 1$, we can assume that L_1 is the x axis $\mathbb{R}(1,0,0)$; L_2 is parallel to the xz plane, and L_2 passes through the point $(0, y_0, 0)$, with $|y_0| \sim 1$. Furthermore, $\angle(L_1, L_2) \approx_{\varepsilon} 1$. Applying a linear transformation with determinant $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ that fixes L_1, we can assume that $L_2 = (0,1,0) + \mathbb{R}(0,0,1)$. After applying this transformation, L_1, L_2, and L_3 are still 1 separated with error $\delta^{C_0\varepsilon}$; L_1, L_2, and L_3 are still $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ skew; L_3 makes an angle $\approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ with the xz plane; and L_3 intersects $B(0, \delta^{-C_1\varepsilon})$, where C_1 is an absolute constant.

Thus L_3 contains a point $(x_0, 0, z_0)$ with $|z_0| \approx_{\varepsilon} 1$ and $|x_0| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} 1$. Observe that any affine transformation of the form

$$(x,y,z) \mapsto (ax + b(1-y),\ y,\ cz + dy)$$

fixes the lines L_1 and L_2. Let T_1 be the transformation of the above type with $a = 1,\ b = 1 - x_0,\ c = 1/z_0,\ d = 1$. Then $T(x_0, 0, z_0) = (1,0,1)$, so $(1,0,1) \in T_1(L_3)$. Abusing notation slightly, we will

apply the transformation T_1 to the lines L_1, L_2, and L_3, and call their images L_1, L_2, and L_3 as well. Note that L_3 still makes an angle $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ with the xz plane. Thus we can select a point $(x_1, 1/2, z_1) \in L_3$ with $|x_1|, |z_1| \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$.

Furthermore, since L_3 is $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew to $L_2 = (0,1,0) + \mathbb{R}(0,0,1)$, we have $|x_1 - 1/2| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$, i.e. $|x_1 - 1/2| \geq \delta^{C_2\varepsilon}$ for some absolute constant C_2. If not, then L_3 must lie in the $\delta^{C_2\varepsilon}$ neighborhood of the plane $(1,0,1) + (1,1,0)^\perp = (1,0,0) + (1,1,0)^\perp$. This plane contains the line L_2. Thus if C_2 is chosen sufficiently large, then this contradicts the assumption that L_2 and L_3 are $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew.

Now consider the map

$$(x, y, z) \mapsto (ax + (1-a)(1-y),\ y,\ z + dy).$$

This map fixes the lines L_1 and L_2, and the point $(1,0,1)$. We wish to select a map of the above form so that the image of L_3 under this map points in the $(0,1,0)$ direction, i.e.

$$(1,0,0) \cdot \Big((ax_1 + (1-a)(1-1/2), 1/2, z_1 + d(1/2)) - (1,0,1) \Big) = 0,$$
$$(0,0,1) \cdot \Big((ax_1 + (1-a)(1-1/2), 1/2, z_1 + d(1/2)) - (1,0,1) \Big) = 0.$$

We conclude that $a = 1/(2x_1 - 1),\ d = 2 - 2z_1$. This linear map has determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} a & a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d & 1 \end{vmatrix} = a = 1/(2x_1 - 1) \approx_\varepsilon 1,$$

which completes the proof. □

2.4 Regulus strips

Definition 2.4. *Let R be a regulus that intersects the unit ball. We say that R is δ^ε non-degenerate if there are three lines contained in R that intersect the unit ball and that are pairwise $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew. By Lemma 2.7, the Gauss curvature of such a regulus has magnitude $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ on $B(0,1) \cap R$. If the value of ε is apparent from context, we may say that a regulus is "non-degenerate" if it is $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$ non-degenerate for some absolute constant C.*

Definition 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3$ be three tubes. The set $R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}$ is the union of all lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that intersect the lines coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1$, $\mathcal{T}_2$, and $\mathcal{T}_3$. In practice these lines will always be skew, so $R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}$ will always be a regulus.*

Definition 2.6. *A δ^ε regulus strip is the intersection of the δ-neighborhood of a δ^ε non-degenerate regulus with the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of a line in the ruling of the regulus. If $R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}$ is a regulus, a "regulus strip" will always refer to the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of a line in the ruling of the regulus that is dual to the lines coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$, and $\mathcal{T}_3$.*

Heuristically, one should think of a regulus strip as a rectangular prism of dimensions $1 \times \delta^{1/2} \times \delta$ that has been "twisted" along its long axis. A regulus strip can also be thought of as a union of $\delta^{-1/2}$ disjoint rectangular prisms, each of dimensions $\delta^{1/2} \times \delta^{1/2} \times \delta$. Each of these prisms has a normal vector (defined up to uncertainty $\delta^{1/2}$), and these normal vectors point in $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$–separated directions.

3 The structure of Besicovitch sets near dimension $5/2$

Definition 3.1. *We say a set $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ of δ–tubes satisfying the Wolff axioms is ε–extremal if*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \geq \delta^{\varepsilon}, \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\Big|\bigcup_{\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T})\Big| \leq \delta^{1/2-\varepsilon}. \tag{3.2}$$

Observe that (3.1) *implies that $|\mathbb{T}| \gtrsim \delta^{-2+\varepsilon}$. On the other hand, since $\mathbb{T}$ satisfies the Wolff axioms we must have $|\mathbb{T}| \lesssim \delta^{-2}$.*

3.1 Wolff's Hairbrush estimate and its consequences

In this section we will show that every ε–extremal set of tubes must have a certain structure. The main tool we will use is Wolff's maximal function estimate at dimension $5/2$.

Theorem 3.1 (Wolff [17])**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of δ–tubes that satisfy the Wolff axioms and suppose that $\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \geq \lambda\delta^2|\mathbb{T}|$ for some $\delta \leq \lambda \leq 1$. Then for each $s > 0$, there is a constant C_s so that*

$$\Big|\bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T})\Big| \geq C_s\lambda^{5/2}\delta^{1/2+s}(\delta^2|\mathbb{T}|)^{3/4}. \tag{3.3}$$

A key lemma used to prove Wolff's result shows that the "hairbrush" of a tube has large volume:

Lemma 3.1 (Wolff [17])**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of δ–tubes that satisfy the Wolff axioms and suppose that $\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \geq \lambda\delta^2|\mathbb{T}|$ for some $\delta \leq \lambda \leq 1$. Let $L \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a line and suppose that each tube $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ intersects L and satisfies $\angle(v(L), v(\mathcal{T})) \geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$. Then for each $s > 0$, there is a constant C_s so that*

$$\Big|\bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T})\Big| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon} C_s\lambda^{3/2}\delta^{2+s}|\mathbb{T}|.$$

Theorem 3.1 has several consequences, which we will detail below.

Definition 3.2. *We say that a pair $(\mathbb{T}', Y')$ is a refinement of $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ if $\mathbb{T}' \subset \mathbb{T}$, $Y'(\mathcal{T}) \subset Y(\mathcal{T})$ for each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$, and*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}'} |Y'(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon} \sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})|.$$

The meaning of the variable ε will always be apparent from context.

If $(\mathbb{T}', Y')$ is a refinement of $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ with $\mathbb{T}' = \mathbb{T}$, then we may refer to the refinement as $(\mathbb{T}, Y')$. If $(\mathbb{T}', Y')$ is a refinement of $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ with $Y'(\mathcal{T}) = Y(\mathcal{T})$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$, then we may refer to the refinement simply as $\mathbb{T}'$.

In order to study a set $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ of tubes and their associated shadings, it will often be helpful to consider the function $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} \chi_{Y(T)}$. This is a function that takes integer values between 0 and $|\mathbb{T}|$. Frequently, we will use dyadic pigeonholing to find a refinement $(\mathbb{T}, Y')$ so that $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} \chi_{Y'(T)}(p) \sim \mu\chi_A(p)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Here μ is an integer and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\mu|A| \sim \sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y'(\mathcal{T})|$. If $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is ε-extremal, then $\mu \approx_{\varepsilon} \delta^{-1/2}$ and $|A| \approx_{\varepsilon} \delta^{1/2}$. In future, we will perform this type of dyadic pigeonholing without remarking on it further.

The next lemma allows us to reduce to the case where most pairs of intersecting tubes make a large angle. Arguments of this type appear frequently in the Kakeya literature, and the following lemma is a standard application of common techniques.

Lemma 3.2 (Robust transversality)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes. Then there is a refinement $(\mathbb{T}, Y')$ so that $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} \chi_{Y'(T)} \sim \mu\chi_A$, and for each $p \in A$ and each unit vector v, we have*

$$|\{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}\colon p \in Y'(\mathcal{T}),\ \angle(v(\mathcal{T}), v) \le \theta\}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta^{1/10}|\{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}\colon p \in Y'(\mathcal{T})\}|. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that if $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ obeys the conclusions of (3.2) and if $(\mathbb{T}', Y')$ is a refinement of $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ with $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}'} \chi_{Y'(\mathcal{T})} \sim \mu\chi_A$, then $(\mathbb{T}', Y')$ must also obey the conclusions of (3.2) (though the implicit constant in (3.4) may be larger).

The next lemma is a version of Lemma 3.1 where both the assumptions and conclusion have been weakened. It says that if all of the tubes in a Besicovitch set intersect the (thickened) neighborhood of a line segment, then the union of these tubes must have large volume.

Lemma 3.3 (Volume of a fat hairbrush)**.** *Let $\rho > \delta$. Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of δ tubes that satisfy the Wolff axioms. Suppose that $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \ge \delta^{2+\varepsilon}|\mathbb{T}|$, and that there exists a line L so that $\mathcal{T} \cap N_\rho(L) \neq \emptyset$ and $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ L) \ge \delta^\varepsilon$ for each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. Then*

$$\Big|\bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T})\Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}\rho^{-1/4}(\delta^2|\mathbb{T}|). \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. Since $\mathbb{T}$ satisfies the Wolff axioms, we have $|\mathbb{T}| \lesssim \delta^{-2}$. Replacing $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ by a refinement if necessary, we can assume that $|Y(\mathcal{T})| \ge \frac{1}{C}\delta^\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}|$ for each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, where C is an absolute constant, and that $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(T)| \gtrsim \delta^\varepsilon$. Let $\Pi_i,\ i = 1, \dots, \rho^{-1}$ be a set of planes that contain L and have normal vectors that point in ρ–separated directions. For each index i, let H_i be the ρ–neighborhood of Π_i. Then the sets $\{H_i \backslash N_{\delta^{2\varepsilon}}(L)\}$ are at most $\delta^{-2\varepsilon}$-overlapping. Note as well that since $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ L) \ge \delta^\varepsilon$ for each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|Y(\mathcal{T})\backslash N_{\delta^{2\varepsilon}}(L)| \gtrsim \delta^\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}|.$$

Observe that if $\mathcal{T}$ is a δ–tube that intersects $N_\rho(L)$, then there exists (at least one) index i so that $\mathcal{T} \subset 2H_i$. Assign each tube $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ to an index i. For each index i, let N_i be the number of tubes assigned to i.

By Theorem 3.1, for each index i we have

$$\Big|\bigcup_{\substack{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}\\ \mathcal{T}\text{ assigned to }H_i}} Y(\mathcal{T})\backslash N_{\delta^{2\varepsilon}}(L)\Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}(\delta^2 N_i)^{3/4}. \tag{3.6}$$

Since the tubes in $\mathbb{T}$ satisfy the Wolff axioms, we have $N_i \le \rho\delta^{-2}$ for each index i, and of course $\sum_i N_i \ge |\mathbb{T}|$. Thus by appling Theorem 3.1 to the set of tubes assigned to each H_i and summing, we obtain

$$\sum_i \Big|\bigcup_{\substack{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}\\ \mathcal{T}\text{ assigned to }H_i}} Y(\mathcal{T})\backslash N_{\delta^{2\varepsilon}}(L)\Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}\rho^{-1/4}(\delta^2|\mathbb{T}|).$$

Since the sets $\{H_i\}$ are at most $\delta^{2\varepsilon}$–overlapping, we have

$$\Big|\bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T})\Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}\rho^{-1/4}(\delta^2|\mathbb{T}|). \qquad \square$$

Corollary 3.1 (Few tubes in a fat hairbrush)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes. Then for every line $L \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, we have*

$$|\{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}\colon \mathcal{T} \cap N_\rho(L) \neq \emptyset,\ \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ L) \ge \delta^\varepsilon\}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-2}\rho^{1/4}.$$

At the beginning of Section 2.3, we observed that three skew lines either determine a hyperbolic paraboloid or a hyperboloid. The next lemma shows that if most triples of tubes in a Besicovitch set are parallel to a common plane, then the Besicovitch set must have large volume. In particular, this means that hyperbolic paraboloids will not play an important role in the analysis of Besicovitch sets. The proof of the next lemma is nearly identical to the proof of Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.4 (Tubes parallel to a common plane have large union)**.** *Let $\rho > \delta$. Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of δ tubes that satisfy the Wolff axioms. Suppose that $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$, and that there exists a unit vector v_0 so that $v(T)\cdot v_0 \leq \rho$ for each $\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}$. Then*

$$\Big|\bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T})\Big| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon} \delta^{1/2}\rho^{-1/4}. \tag{3.7}$$

3.2 Planiness

In this section, we will show that for each point $p\in\mathbb{R}^3$, there is a plane Π_p containing p so that all of the tubes containing p make a small angle with Π_p. This is a consequence of Bennett, Carbery, and Tao's multilinear Kakeya theorem from [1]. The version we will use here is a variant due to Bourgain and Guth.

Theorem 3.2 (Bourgain-Guth, [4], Theorem 6)**.** *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a set of δ–tubes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Then for each $s>0$, there exists a constant C_s so that*

$$\Big(\int \sum_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3\in\mathbb{T}} \chi_{\mathcal{T}_1}\chi_{\mathcal{T}_2}\chi_{\mathcal{T}_3}\ \big|v(\mathcal{T}_1)\wedge v(\mathcal{T}_2)\wedge v(\mathcal{T}_2)\big|\Big)^{1/2} \leq C_s\delta^{-s}(\delta^2|\mathbb{T}|)^{3/2}. \tag{3.8}$$

Lemma 3.5 (Planiness)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of ε–extremal tubes. Then there is a refinement Y' of Y so that for each $p\in\mathbb{R}^3$ there is a plane Π_p so that if $p\in Y'(\mathcal{T})$, then*

$$\angle\big(v(\mathcal{T}),\ \Pi_p\big) \lessapprox_{\varepsilon} \delta^{1/2}.$$

Proof. First apply Lemma 3.2 to $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$, and let $(\mathbb{T}, Y_1)$ be the resulting refinement. Recall that $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}}\chi_{Y_1(\mathcal{T})} \sim \mu\chi_A$ for some number $\mu\approx_{\varepsilon}\delta^{-1/2}$ and some set $A\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ with $|A|\approx_{\varepsilon}\delta^{1/2}$. Next, there exists a subset $A_1\subset A$ with $|A_1|\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon}|A|$ and a number τ so that for every point $p\in A_1$, there are $\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon}\mu^3$ triples $\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3$ satisfying:

- $p\in Y_1(\mathcal{T}_1)\cap Y_1(\mathcal{T}_2)\cap Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3)$,
- $\big|v(\mathcal{T}_1)\wedge v(\mathcal{T}_2)\wedge v(\mathcal{T}_3)\big|\sim\tau$,
- $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_i), v(\mathcal{T}_j)) \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon} 1$ if $i\neq j$.

(The last item holds because each point $p\in A_1$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 3.2). The bound (3.8) implies that $\tau\lessapprox_{\varepsilon}\delta^{1/2}$. Thus for each $p\in A_1$, there is a pair $(\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2)$ with $p\in Y_1(\mathcal{T}_1)\cap Y_1(\mathcal{T}_2)$ and $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_1),\ v(\mathcal{T}_2))\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon}1$ so that if Π_p is the plane containing p spanned by the vectors $v(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $v(\mathcal{T}_2)$, then there is an absolute constant C so that

$$|\{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}\colon p\in Y_1(\mathcal{T}),\ \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\Pi_p)\leq\delta^{1/2-C\varepsilon}\}| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon}\delta^{-1/2}.$$

For each $\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}$, define

$$Y'(\mathcal{T}) = \{p\in Y_1(\mathcal{T})\colon \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\Pi_p)\leq\delta^{1/2-C\varepsilon}\}. \quad \square$$

Definition 3.3. *If $(\mathcal{T}, Y)$ satisfies the conclusions of Lemma 3.5, then we say it is plany.*

3.3 Hairbrushes

Definition 3.4. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of tubes and let $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k \in \mathbb{T}$. We define the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots \mathcal{T}_k$ to be the set of tubes from $\mathbb{T}$ that intersect each of $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots \mathcal{T}_k$. More precisely, we define*

$$H_Y(\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k) = \{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T} \colon Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y(\mathcal{T}_i) \neq \emptyset,\ i = 1, \dots, k\}. \tag{3.9}$$

If there is no chance of confusion we may omit the subscript Y in (3.9).

The next lemma says that the tubes in a hairbrush cannot all lie near a common plane. Again, the following lemma is a standard application of common techniques.

Lemma 3.6 (Most tubes in a hairbrush are skew)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes and let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Then there is an absolute constant C so that*

$$|\{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k) \in \mathbb{T}^{k+1} \colon \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k \in H(\mathcal{T});\ \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k \text{ are pairwise } \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon} \text{ separated and skew}\}|$$
$$\approx_\varepsilon |\{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k) \in \mathbb{T}^{k+1} \colon \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k \in H(\mathcal{T})\}|.$$

3.4 The regulus map

Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes and let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. For each $p \in Y(T)$, there is an associated plane Π_p, as described in Lemma 3.5. In this section, we will ask: as the point p moves along the tube $\mathcal{T}$, how does Π_p change? Sometimes, a particularly interesting phenomena occurs: at coarse scales, the plane Π_x looks like the tangent plane to a regulus containing the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}$. If this happens, we say that the tube $\mathcal{T}$ has a "regulus map." The presence or absence of these regulus maps will steer our proof towards either the Heisenberg or SL_2 examples. This statement will be made precise in Section 4.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes that is plany. Then there exists*

- *A number $\delta^{1/2} \leq \theta \leq 1$.*
- *A refinement $(\mathbb{T}', Y')$ of $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$.*
- *For each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$, a non-degenerate regulus $R(\mathcal{T})$ containing the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}$.*

So that if $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$ and $p \in Y'(\mathcal{T})$, then $\angle(\Pi_p, T_p R(\mathcal{T})) \approx_\varepsilon \theta$.

Proof. Refining $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ if necessary, we can assume that $\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_{Y(\mathcal{T})} \sim \mu \chi_A$ for some number $\mu \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$ and some set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with $|A| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tube and let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3 \in H(\mathcal{T})$ be three tubes that are pairwise $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew, and satisfy $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_i)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1,\ i = 1, 2, 3$. If $\mathcal{T}_4 \in H(\mathcal{T})$ with $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_4)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$, then there is a number $\delta^{1/2} \leq \theta \leq 1$ so that $|\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_4),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3}) - \theta| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ for all $p \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_4$ (recall that $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_4$ is contained in a ball of radius $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$). We will abuse notation slightly and say $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_4),\ R_{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3}) \sim \theta$.

Define the set of quintuples

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_4) \colon \mathcal{T}_i \in H(\mathcal{T}) \text{ and } \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_i)) \geq \delta^{C_1 \varepsilon},\ i = 1, 2, 3, 4;$$
$$\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_4 \text{ are pairwise } \delta^{C_1 \varepsilon} \text{ separated and skew}\}.$$

By Lemma 3.6, if the constant C_1 is chosen sufficiently large then $|\mathcal{Q}| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-2-(3/2)4} = \delta^{-8}$. Select θ so that

$$|\{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_4) \in \mathcal{Q} \colon \angle(v(\mathcal{T}_4),\ R_{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3}) \sim \theta\}| \geq |\log \delta|^{-1} |\mathcal{Q}|,$$

and call this set of quintuples $\mathcal{Q}_\theta$. Let $\mathbb{T}' \subset \mathbb{T}$ be the set of those $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ for which

$$|\{(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_4) \in \mathbb{T}^4 \colon (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_4) \in \mathcal{Q}_\theta\}| \geq \delta^{C_2\varepsilon}|H(\mathcal{T})|^4.$$

If the constant C_2 is chosen sufficiently large then $\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}'} |Y'(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} |Y'(\mathcal{T})|$.

By pigeonholing, for each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$ we can select tubes $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3 \in H(\mathcal{T})$ so that

$$|\{\mathcal{T}_4 \in H(\mathcal{T}) \colon (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_4) \in \mathcal{Q}_\theta\}| \geq \delta^{C_2\varepsilon}|H(\mathcal{T})|.$$

Define $R(\mathcal{T}) = R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}$. $R(\mathcal{T})$ is a non-degenerate regulus, in the sense of definition 2.4.

Observe that if $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{T}_4) \in \mathcal{Q}_\theta$ and if $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_4),\ R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}) \sim \theta$, then

$$\angle(\Pi_p, T_pR_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}) \approx_\varepsilon \theta$$

whenever $p \in Y_1(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y_1(\mathcal{T}_4)$. Thus if $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$,

$$|\{p \in Y_1(\mathcal{T}) \colon \angle(\Pi_p, T_pR(\mathcal{T})) \approx_\varepsilon \theta\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon |Y_1(\mathcal{T})|. \tag{3.10}$$

Define $Y'(\mathcal{T}) \subset Y_1(\mathcal{T})$ to be the set in the LHS of (3.10). We have

$$\sum_{\mathbb{T}'} |Y'(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \sum_{\mathbb{T}'} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \sum_{\mathbb{T}} |Y(\mathcal{T})|.$$

Furthermore, for each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$ and each $p \in Y'(\mathcal{T})$ we have $\angle(\Pi_p, T_pR(\mathcal{T})) \approx_\varepsilon \theta$. □

Definition 3.5. *We say that an ε-extremal set of tubes obeys the regulus map at scale θ if it satisfies the conclusions of Lemma 3.7.*

Remark 3.1. If $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ obeys the regulus map at scale θ and if $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, then the function $p \mapsto T_pR(\mathcal{T})$ is called the *regulus map* associated to the tube $\mathcal{T}$. If we identify the unit line segment coaxial with $\mathcal{T}$ with the interval $[0, 1]$, and if $\mathrm{Gr}(2, \mathbb{R}^3)$ is the (affine) Grassmannian of two-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^3$, then the regulus map of $\mathcal{T}$ becomes a function $f_\mathcal{T} \colon [0, 1] \to \mathrm{Gr}(2, \mathbb{R}^3)$ that is described by three parameters.

In particular, if $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in \mathcal{T}$ are three $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ separated points, and if Π_1, Π_2, and Π_3 are three planes containing the points p_1, p_2, and p_3 respectively, then there is a unique (up to uncertainty $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$) regulus map $p \mapsto T_pR(\mathcal{T})$ satisfying $\angle(T_{p_i}R(\mathcal{T}),\ \Pi_i) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta,\ i = 1, 2, 3$.

Remark 3.2. A useful way of interpreting the regulus map is as follows. Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ and let L be a line in $R(\mathcal{T}_0)$ in the same ruling as $\mathcal{T}_0$ that is δ/θ separated (with error $\approx_\varepsilon 1$) and $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew to the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_0$. By Lemma 2.4, such an L must exist. Let $\mathcal{T}_1$ be the δ–neighborhood of L.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tube (not necessarily from $\mathbb{T}$) with the following properties: $\mathcal{T}$ intersects $\mathcal{T}_0$; $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$; and $\mathcal{T}$ makes an angle $\leq \theta$ with the tangent plane of $R(\mathcal{T})$ at the point $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_0$. Then $\mathcal{T}$ also intersects the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$–neighborhood of $\mathcal{T}_1$. Conversely, if $\mathcal{T}$ intersects $\mathcal{T}_0$; $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$; and $\mathcal{T}$ also intersects $\mathcal{T}_1$, then $\mathcal{T}$ must make an angle $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$ with the tangent plane of $R(\mathcal{T})$ every point in $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_0$.

This means that for each $\mathcal{T}_0 \in \mathbb{T}$, there is a tube $\mathcal{T}_1$ (not necessarily in $\mathbb{T}$) that is δ/θ separated from $\mathcal{T}_0$ with error $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ so that for each constant C_1, there are constants C_2 and C_3 so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_0) \colon \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \geq \delta^\varepsilon,\ \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ T_pR(\mathcal{T}_0)) \leq \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}\theta\} \\
&\quad \subset \{\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_0) \colon \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \geq \delta^\varepsilon,\ \mathcal{T} \cap N_{\delta^{1-C_2\varepsilon}}(\mathcal{T}_1) \neq \emptyset\} \\
&\quad\quad \subset \{\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_0) \colon \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \geq \delta^\varepsilon,\ \angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ T_pR(\mathcal{T}_0)) \leq \delta^{C_3\varepsilon}\theta\},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where in the above equation, $T_pR(\mathcal{T}_0)$ is the tangent plane of the regulus $R(\mathcal{T}_0)$ at a point $p \in \mathcal{T}_0 \cap \mathcal{T}$ (of course the intersection consists of more than one point, but since $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \gtrsim_\varepsilon 1$, the intersection is contained in a ball of radius $\lesssim_\varepsilon \delta$, so the choice of p does not matter). The requirement that $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \geq \delta^\varepsilon$ in each of the three sets above can also be replaced with a requirement of the form $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}),\ v(\mathcal{T}_0)) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$; doing so will also change the constants C_2 and C_3.

We can think of $\mathcal{T}_1$ as a "virtual tube" (we call it virtual since it need not be in the set $\mathbb{T}$) that describes the regulus map of $\mathcal{T}_0$. We will write $\mathcal{T}_1 = V(\mathcal{T}_0)$.

3.5 The hairbrush of two tubes is contained in a fat regulus

If L_1, L_2, and L_3 are three skew lines, then the union of all lines intersecting each of L_1, L_2, and L_3 forms a regulus. On the other hand, the union of all lines that merely intersect L_1 and L_2 fill out all of $\mathbb{R}^3$. In general, one would expect similar statements to hold if lines are replaced by tubes.

As we will see in the following section, however, if we restrict attention to tubes obeying the regulus map at scale θ, then the union of all tubes that intersect *two* skew tubes $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ is contained in the θ-neighborhood of a regulus. This is because every tube intersecting $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ must also intersect the "virtual tube" associated to $\mathcal{T}_1$. This fact will have several implications, which we will explore below.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ be two tubes whose coaxial lines L_1 and L_2 are $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew. Let L_1' be the line coaxial with $V(\mathcal{T}_1)$.*

Then there is a number $\theta' \approx_\varepsilon \theta$ so that $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is contained in a union of $\lesssim_\varepsilon \theta^{-1}$ distinct θ'-tubes (the θ'–neighborhoods of unit line segments) that are $\lesssim_\varepsilon 1$ overlapping. Each of these θ' tubes contains (at least one) line that intersects L_1, L_2, and L_1'. Each tube in $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is contained in at least one of the θ'-tubes.

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{T}_1$ is a tube of length one and thickness δ. Thus we can cover $\mathcal{T}_1$ by union of θ^{-1} disjoint tube segments of length θ (and thickness δ). Observe that if there is a number $\theta_1 \lesssim_\varepsilon \theta$ so that if $p, q \in \mathcal{T}_1$ lie in the same tube segment then $\angle(T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1),\ T_qR(\mathcal{T}_1)) \leq \theta_1$. For each tube segment, associate the set $N_{\theta_1}(T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1))$, where p is a point in the tube segment. We will call these sets "slabs"; each slab is the θ_1–neighborhood of a plane. Observe that if $Y(\mathcal{T})$ intersects $Y(\mathcal{T}_1)$, then $\mathcal{T}$ is contained in the slab associated to the segment at which the intersection occurs (if the set $Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y(\mathcal{T}_1)$ intersects more than one tube segment, then $\mathcal{T}$ is contained in all of the corresponding slabs).

Since $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew, $v(\mathcal{T}_2)$ makes an angle $\gtrsim_\varepsilon 1$ with any plane containing the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1$. Thus each set of the form $N_{\theta_1}(T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1))$ intersects $\mathcal{T}_2$ in a tube segment of length $\approx_\varepsilon \theta_1$, and these tube segments are $\lesssim_\varepsilon 1$ overlapping. Thus if W is a tube segment from $\mathcal{T}_1$ of length θ, then the set of tubes in $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ that intersect $\mathcal{T}_1$ at a point of W are contained in the $\theta' \approx_\varepsilon \theta_1$ neighborhood of a line segment.

Finally, observe that $N_{\theta_1}(T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1))$ is comparable[3] to the θ_1–neighborhood of the plane spanned by p and L_1^*. If this plane intersects L_2 at the point q, then the line containing p and q intersects each of L_1, L_2, and L_1', and the line is contained in $N_{\theta_1}(T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1)) \cap \mathcal{T}_2$. Thus each of the θ'-tubes described above contains a line that intersects each of L_1, L_2, and L_1'. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ be two tubes that are $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew. Then $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is contained in the $\lesssim_\varepsilon \theta$-neighborhood of a non-degenerate regulus; we will call this regulus $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$.*

[3]We say that two sets A and B are comparable if there is an absolute constant $C \geq 1$ (independent of δ) so that B is contained in the C-fold dilate of A and vice-versa.

3.6 The Hair on $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is spiky

In the previous section, we showed that $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is contained in the θ–neighborhood of a regulus. In this section, we will show that most tubes in the remainder of the Besicovitch set intersect this regulus transversely. A precise statement is given in Lemma 3.12.

Definition 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ be tubes. We say that the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ (with error s) if*

$$\Big| Y(\mathcal{T}_2) \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_1)} Y(\mathcal{T}) \Big| \geq s |\mathcal{T}_2|.$$

The following lemma is a simple consequence of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes. Then there is a constant C so that there are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon |\mathbb{T}|^2$ pairs $(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \in \mathbb{T}$ so that $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers tube $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$.*

Note that if $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew, and if the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$, then there is a subset $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \subset H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ of cardinality $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1}$ so that the sets $\{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \colon \mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\}$ intersect with multiplicity $\lesssim 1$. We will call $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ the refined hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$. Note that $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ need not be the same as $H'(\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_1)$.

The next lemma says that the refined hairbrush $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is evenly spread out over the θ–neighborhood of the regulus $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ be tubes whose coaxial lines are $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew. Suppose that the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$. Let $H' \subset H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ be the refined hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$.*

Then for each $\rho \geq \theta$, $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ can be covered by $\sim \rho^{-2}$ boundedly overlapping ρ–balls. For each of these balls B, we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap B| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \rho^{-2} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \approx_\varepsilon \rho^{-2} \delta.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.8, $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ can be covered by $\approx_\varepsilon \rho^{-1}$ ρ–tubes that are $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ overlapping.

Since the sets $\{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \colon \mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\}$ are $\lesssim 1$ overlapping, at most $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \rho \delta^{-1}$ of the tubes from $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ can be contained in each ρ–tube. Furthermore, if we cover each ρ–tube with ρ^{-1} boundedly overlapping balls of radius ρ, then for each such ball B, we have

$$\Big| B \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} Y(\mathcal{T}) \Big| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \rho(\rho/\delta)(\delta^2) = \rho^2 \delta. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 3.11 (Geometric lemma)**.** *Let Z be a smooth surface contained in the unit ball. Suppose that at each point $p \in Z$, the Gauss curvature satisfies $\delta^\varepsilon \leq |K_p| \lesssim 1$. Let ℓ be a line segment of length ≤ 1 contained in the unit ball. Let $\rho > \delta$, and cover ℓ by a set $\{I_j\}$ of disjoint intervals, each of length ρ. For each index j, let Π_j be a 2–plane containing ℓ.*

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\ell &= \{\ell' \text{ a line}\colon \ell' \text{ meets } \ell \text{ at a point in } I_j, \text{ and } \angle(\ell', \Pi_j) \leq \rho\}, \\ \mathcal{L}_Z &= \{\ell' \text{ a line}\colon \ell' \text{ intersects } N_\rho(Z) \text{ at a point } p, \text{ and } \angle(\ell', T_p Z) \leq \rho\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Let

$$Z_{\text{covered}} = \{p \in N_\rho(Z)\colon \text{ there exists } \ell' \in \mathcal{L}_\ell \cap \mathcal{L}_Z \text{ that intersects } p\}. \tag{3.13}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho(Z_{\text{covered}}) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \rho^{-7/4}, \tag{3.14}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\rho$ is the ρ covering number (i.e. the number of ρ–balls required to cover the set.) The estimate (3.14) *is nontrivial, since $\mathcal{E}_\rho(Z) \sim \rho^{-2}$.*

Proof. Cover $N_\rho(Z)$ by $O(\rho^{-1})$ $O(1)$-overlapping rectangular prisms of dimensions $\rho^{1/2} \times \rho^{1/2} \times \rho$. We will call these rectangular prisms "squares." For each square S, let Π_S be the tangent plane of Z at S (this is well-defined up to error $O(\rho^{1/2})$). Since $|K_p| \geq \delta^\varepsilon$ for all $p \in Z$, the normal vectors of the planes Π_S point in $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \rho^{1/2}$–separated directions. We will first establish the following estimate for each square S:

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho(Z_{\text{covered}} \cap S) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2}\big(\angle(\Pi_S,\ \ell) + \rho\big)^{-2}. \tag{3.15}$$

Fix a square S and let $\theta = \angle(\Pi_S,\ \ell) + \rho$. Then $\Pi_S^\rho \cap \ell$ is an interval of length $\sim \rho/\theta$, so it contains $\sim \theta^{-1}$ of the intervals $\{I_j\}$. If I_j is such an interval, we have that $\Pi_j^\rho \cap \Pi_S^\rho$ is comparable to a rectangular prism of dimensions $1 \times \frac{\rho}{\theta} \times \rho$. Thus $\Pi_j^\rho \cap \Pi_S^\rho \cap S$ is contained in a rectangular prism of dimensions $\rho^{1/2} \times \frac{\rho}{\theta} \times \rho$. The ρ covering number of such a rectangular prism is $\rho^{-1/2}\theta^{-1}$. I.e. we have

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho(\{p \in S\colon \text{ there exists } \ell' \in \mathcal{L}_\ell \cap \mathcal{L}_Z \text{ such that } \ell' \cap \ell \in I_j,\ p \in \ell' \cap Z\}) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2}\theta^{-1}.$$

Since there are $O(\theta^{-1})$ intervals $\{I_j\}$ that can contribute to (3.15), this establishes (3.15).

Now, for each $\rho \leq \theta \leq 1$, there are $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta^{1/2}/\rho$ squares S with $\angle(\Pi_S, \ell) \sim \theta$ (this is probably a very inefficient estimate; it just uses the fact that the normal vectors of the squares point in $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \rho^{1/2}$–separated directions). Of course, each square can contribute at most ρ^{-1} to the size of Z_{covered}. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_\rho\big(Z_{\text{covered}}\big) &\lessapprox_\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{\theta \text{ dyadic} \\ \rho \leq \theta \leq 1}} \big(\theta^{1/2}/\rho\big) \min\big(\rho^{-1},\ \rho^{-1/2}\theta^{-2}\big) \\ &\lessapprox_\varepsilon \rho^{-7/4}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.12. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Then there is a pair of tubes $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ so that the following holds*

- *$\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew.*
- *The hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$.*
- *There is a constant C so that*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} \big|\{\mathcal{T}' \in H(\mathcal{T})\colon \angle(v(\mathcal{T}'), T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon} \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{T}' \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\}\big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2}. \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T}_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\left|\bigcup_{\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_0)} Y(\mathcal{T})\right| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. For each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, define $Y_1(\mathcal{T}) = Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}' \in H(\mathcal{T}_0)} Y(\mathcal{T})$. Let Y_2 be a refinement of Y_1 so that $\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_{Y_2(\mathcal{T})} \sim \mu \chi_A$ for some $\mu \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$. Note that $(\mathbb{T}, Y_2)$ is still an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ.

Using Lemma 3.9 along with standard pigeonholing arguments, we can find tubes $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ so that $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ and

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'_Y(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |Y_2(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta. \tag{3.17}$$

In particular, this means $\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'_Y(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |H_{Y_2}(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2}$.

By Lemma 3.10, we can cover $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ by $\approx_\varepsilon \theta^{-2}$ θ-balls, and each of these balls B satisfies $\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'_Y(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |B \cap Y_2(\mathcal{T})| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta^2 \delta$. Thus we can cover $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ by $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-2C_1\varepsilon}$ balls of radius $\delta^{-C_1\varepsilon}$ (C_1 is a constant to be chosen later), and for each of these balls B we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'_Y(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |B \cap Y_2(\mathcal{T})| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1+2C_1\varepsilon}. \tag{3.18}$$

Let $Z = R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ and let L be the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_0$. Cover L by disjoint line segments of length $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ and for each such line segment I_j, let Π_j be a plane containing L that is tangent to the regulus $R(\mathcal{T}_0)$ at some point of I_j. Note that the choice of Π_j is uniquely defined up to error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$.

Apply Lemma 3.11 to Z and L with this choice of planes and with $\rho = \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$. Observe that if $p \in Z = R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is not a point in Z_{covered}, then any tube $\mathcal{T}' \in H(\mathcal{T}_0)$ that intersects p must satisfy $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}'), T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)) \geq \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$. In particular, if $p \in Y(\mathcal{T}')$ (NB: this will be the case if $p \in Y_2(\mathcal{T})$ for some $\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$) then the plane map Π_p must satisfy

$$\angle(\Pi_p, T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}.$$

Since the tubes passing through p satisfy the robust transversality estimate (3.4), this means that if the constant C is chosen sufficiently large, then

$$|\{\mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T} \colon p \in Y(\mathcal{T}'),\ \angle\big(v(\mathcal{T}'), T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\big) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon} \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{T}' \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}. \tag{3.19}$$

By Lemma 3.11, at most $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{(-7/4)C_1\varepsilon}$ of the $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ balls B intersect Z_{covered}. Call this set of balls "bad." By (3.18) we have

$$\sum_{B \text{ bad}} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'_Y(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |B \cap Y_2(\mathcal{T})| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1+(1/4)C_1\varepsilon}.$$

If the constant C_2 is chosen sufficiently large, then by (3.17),

$$\sum_{B \text{ not bad}} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'_Y(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} |B \cap Y_2(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta.$$

Thus if the constant C is chosen sufficiently large, then by (3.19),

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)} \big|\{\mathcal{T}' \in H(\mathcal{T}) \colon \angle(v(\mathcal{T}'), T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon} \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{T}' \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\}\big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2},$$

which is (3.16). □

Remark 3.3. The above proof shows that not only does there exist one pair $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfying the conclusions of the lemma, but there actually exists $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-4}$such pairs. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3) \colon \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3 \text{ are } \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1 \text{ separated and skew,} \\ &\quad \mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3),\ \angle(v(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon} \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{T}_3 \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-13/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

This observation will be used in Section 6.1.

3.7 Regulus maps talk to each other

Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ be two tubes that are $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew and suppose that the hairbrush $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\leq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$. One of the consequences of Lemma 3.8 is that if L is a line that intersects $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ at points p and q, respectively, and if $\angle(L, T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1)) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$, then

$$\angle(L, T_qR(\mathcal{T}_2)) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta. \tag{3.21}$$

The next lemma is an elaboration of the above observation.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ be two tubes whose coaxial lines are $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew and suppose that the hairbrush $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\leq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$. Let $p \in \mathcal{T}_1$ and let L be a line passing through p and intersecting $\mathcal{T}_2$. Let q be a point of intersection of L and $\mathcal{T}_2$. Then*

$$|\angle(L,\ T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1)) - \angle(L,\ T_qR(\mathcal{T}_2))| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta. \tag{3.22}$$

Furthermore,

$$L \cap B(0,1) \subset N_w(R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)), \tag{3.23}$$

where

$$w \lessapprox_\varepsilon \angle(L,\ T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1)) + \theta.$$

Proof. Let L' be a line passing through p that intersects T_2 and satisfies $\angle(v(L'),\ T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1)) \leq \theta$. Then

$$\operatorname{dist}(L \cap T_2, L' \cap T_2) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \angle(v(L),\ T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1)) + \theta. \tag{3.24}$$

Identify the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_2$ with the interval $[0,1]$ (we will use the variable x to denote points in this interval). Since $R(\mathcal{T}_2)$ is non-degenerate, we have

$$\frac{d}{dx}\angle(T_{x_0}R(\mathcal{T}_2), T_x(R(\mathcal{T}_2)) \approx_\varepsilon 1.$$

Thus (3.24) implies (3.23).

By (3.21), we have $\angle(v(L'),\ T_rR(\mathcal{T}_2)) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$ whenever r is a point of intersection of L' and $\mathcal{T}_2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\angle(L,\ T_qR(\mathcal{T}_2)) &\leq \angle(v(L'), T_rR(\mathcal{T}_2)) + \angle(T_qR(\mathcal{T}_2), T_rR(\mathcal{T}_2)) \\ &\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta + \operatorname{dist}(q,r) \\ &\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta + \angle(v(L), T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1)),\end{aligned}$$

which gives us (3.22). □

3.8 The regulus map and the hairbrush of two tubes

Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ be two tubes that are $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon}$ separated and skew. Recall that the hairbrush $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$–neighborhood of the regulus $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$. Let $\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$, and let $\mathcal{T}_3 \in H(\mathcal{T})$. At each point $p \in \mathcal{T}_3$, there are two interesting planes containing p: the tangent plane $T_pR(\mathcal{T}_3)$ arising from the regulus map of $\mathcal{T}_3$, and the tangent plane $T_p(R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3})$ arising from the regulus determined by the lines coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$, and $\mathcal{T}_3$.

If p is a point of intersection of $\mathcal{T}_3$ and $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$, then we expect $T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3)$ and $T_p(R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3})$ to be equal—this is a consequence of planiness. If p is not a point of intersection of $\mathcal{T}_3$ and $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$, however, then there is no reason to expect that the two planes should be equal. The following lemma asserts that indeed, they are not.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ be two tubes whose coaxial lines are $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew. Suppose that the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$. Let $\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ and let $\mathcal{T}_3 \in H(\mathcal{T}_1)$ satisfy*

$$\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon} \text{ for all } p \in\ \mathcal{T}_3 \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2). \tag{3.25}$$

Then there exist two points $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{T}_3$, so that if $p \in \mathcal{T}_3$, then

$$\angle(T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \min\big(\operatorname{dist}(p,\ p_1),\ \operatorname{dist}(p,\ p_2)\big). \tag{3.26}$$

Remark 3.4. Note that (as discussed in Remark 3.1) the tangency information from the regulus map $p \mapsto T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3)$ is defined by three parameters (and is defined up to uncertainty θ). If the point $p \in Y(\mathcal{T}_3)$ is also contained in some tube from $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3)$, then as mentioned above,

$$\angle\big(T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}\big) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta.$$

The tubes from $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3)$ intersect $\mathcal{T}_3$ in at most two intervals of length $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$. This forces the regulus map $p \mapsto T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3)$ to agree with the plane map $p \mapsto T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}$ at two places. But since $R(\mathcal{T}_3)$ is determined by three parameters, we do not expect the two maps to agree for all points $p \in \mathcal{T}_3$.

Proof of Lemma 3.14. Let p_1, p_2 be the two points of intersection of $\mathcal{T}_3 \cap R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}$ (these points are defined up to uncertainty $\approx_\varepsilon \theta$). Let L_3 be the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_3$ and let $p \in L_3$.

Let L be the (unique) line passing through p that interscts the lines coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$. Applying Lemma 3.13 to $\mathcal{T}_3$ and $\mathcal{T}_1$ and then to $\mathcal{T}_3$ and $\mathcal{T}_1$ (using the line L), we conclude that if q_i is a point of intersection of L and $\mathcal{T}_i,\ i = 1, 2$, then

$$\big|\angle(L, T_{q_i} R(\mathcal{T}_i)) - \angle\big(T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}\big)\big| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta.$$

By (3.23) from Lemma 3.13, we have that L is contained in the

$$\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta + \angle\big(T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}\big)$$

neighborhood of $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$, and thus (since $p \in L$), we have

$$\operatorname{dist}(p,\ R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta + \angle\big(T_p R(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3}\big). \tag{3.27}$$

However by (3.25) we have

$$\operatorname{dist}(p,\ R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \min\big(\operatorname{dist}(p, p_1),\ \operatorname{dist}(p, p_2)\big). \tag{3.28}$$

Combining (3.27) and (3.28) we obtain (3.26). ∎

4 Dichotomy: Heisenberg or SL_2

Definition 4.1 (Heisenberg)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of tubes. We say that $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is of* Heisenberg type *(with parameter α and ε) if at most $\delta^{-1/2+\alpha}$ tubes from $\mathbb{T}$ are contained in any δ^{ε}-regulus strip.*

Definition 4.2 (SL_2)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of tubes. We say that $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is of SL_2* type *(with parameter α and ε) if we can write $\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S)$; here each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is a δ^{ε}-regulus strip that contains $\geq \delta^{-1/2+\alpha}$ tubes.*

Remark 4.1. If $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is an ε–extremal set of tubes, we will abuse notation and say that $\mathbb{T}$ is of Heisenberg (resp. SL_2) type with parameter α if it is of Heisenberg (resp. SL_2) type with parameters α and ϵ.

Lemma 4.1 (Decomposing a Besicovitch set into Heisenberg + SL_2)**.** *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ and let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a set of δ tubes. Then we can write $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_1 \sqcup \mathbb{T}_2$, where $\mathbb{T}_1$ is of Heisenberg type (with parameter α and ε), and $\mathbb{T}_2$ of SL_2 type (with parameter α and ε).*

Proof. Define $\mathbb{T}_1^{(0)} = \mathbb{T}$ and define $\mathbb{T}_2^{(0)} = \emptyset$. Assuming that $\mathbb{T}_1^{(j-1)}$ and $\mathbb{T}_2^{(j-1)}$ have already been defined, we proceed as follows. If there exists a δ^{ε} regulus strip that contains at least $\delta^{-1/2+\alpha}$ tubes from $\mathbb{T}_1^{(j-1)}$, then remove these tubes from $\mathbb{T}_1^{(j-1)}$ and place them in $\mathbb{T}_2^{(j-1)}$. Call the resulting sets $\mathbb{T}_1^{(j)}$ and $\mathbb{T}_2^{(j)}$. If no such set exists, then define $\mathbb{T}_1 = \mathbb{T}_1^{(j-1)}$, define $\mathbb{T}_2 = \mathbb{T}_2^{(j-1)}$, and halt the process. Since $|\mathbb{T}_1^{(j)}| \leq |\mathbb{T}| - j\delta^{-1/2+\alpha}$, this process must halt after finitely many steps. □

Remark 4.2. If we apply Lemma 4.1 to an ε–extremal set of tubes, then at least one of $\mathbb{T}_1$ or $\mathbb{T}_2$ must also be ε–extremal.

5 Killing the Heisenberg example

In this section we will show that an ε–extremal set of tubes of Heisenberg type cannot exist. More precisely, we have the following.

Proposition 5.1. *There exist absolute constants C (large) and $c > 0$ (small) so that the following holds. For every $\alpha > 0$, there is a $\delta_0 > 0$ so that if $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, and if $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is an ε–extremal collection of δ tubes that is of Heisenberg type with parameter α and $C\varepsilon$, then $\varepsilon > c\alpha$.*

Our proof will loosely follow the strategy used in [5]. Namely, we will show that if an ε–extremal Besicovitch set of Heisenberg type exists, then it is possible to construct an arrangement of points and lines in the plane that determine many point-line incidences. We will then use a variant of Bourgain's discretized sum-product theorem to show that such an arrangement is impossible.

5.1 Finding the points and lines

Recall that a line in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is described by four parameters. If we fix two lines L_1, L_2, then the set of lines incident to both L_1 and L_2 can be described by two parameters; at least heuristically, a line incident to L_1 and L_2 can be identified with a corresponding point in the plane. In [5], Bourgain, Katz, and Tao make this heuristic precise—working over $\mathbb{F}_p$ rather than $\mathbb{R}$, they exhibited a transformation that sends lines incident to L_1 and L_2 to points in the plane, and they then constructed an incidence arrangement using these points.

In general, we would expect a similar phenomena to hold if the lines L_1 and L_2 are replaced by tubes $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$. If the tubes come from an ε-extremal Besicovitch set that obeys the regulus map at scale θ, however, then Corollary 3.2 asserts that at scale θ, the set of tubes incident to both $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ lie in the θ neighborhood of a regulus, and thus are described by *one* parameter (i.e. the location of the tube along the ruling of the regulus). Thus if one were to map tubes incident $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ to points in the plane, the resulting arrangement of points would lie close to a low degree algebraic curve. Naively, one would expect that this situation is easier to analyze, but it actually closely resembles the "SL_2 example" discussed in the introduction, which is an almost-counter-example to the Kakeya conjecture.

In this section, we will show that if the set of tubes is of Heisenberg type, then at scales smaller than θ^2, the tubes incident to both $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are "truly described" by two parameters, in the sense that they cannot be closely approximated by a simple one-dimensional parameterization[4]. A precise version of this statement is needed in order to apply Bourgain's discreteized sum-product theorem.

In the following lemma, we will begin the process of constructing a planar point-line arrangement with many incidences. First, we will find the two tubes $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ mentioned above.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε-extremal set of tubes that obey the regulus map at scale θ. Then there is a pair of tubes $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ so that the lines coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew; the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$; there exists a set $\mathbb{T}' \subset \mathbb{T}$; a shading Y' of the tubes in $\mathbb{T}'$; and a number $\delta^{1/2-\alpha} \lessapprox_\varepsilon s \lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$ so that for each $\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}'$, the following holds:*

- *$\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3$ are pairwise $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew, and $\mathcal{T}_3$ makes an angle $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ with the plane spanned by the directions of $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$.*
- $$|H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \cap H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2} |\mathbb{T}'|^{-1}. \tag{5.1}$$
- *All of the tubes in the set from (5.1) are contained in the s–neighborhood of a line (the line depends on the choice of $\mathcal{T}_3$).*
- *The tubes in the set from (5.1) cannot be contained in a smaller neighborhood of a line; more precisely, for any $0 < r < 1$, at most a r^ε fraction of the tubes are contained in the rs–neighborhood of a line.*

Note that here, one expects tubes in the set $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \cap H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)$ to lie near the regulus $R_{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3}$. At the same time, because of the regulus map, we expect the tubes of $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ to lie in the θ neighborhood of the regulus $R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$. It is this double affiliation which we will be exploiting.

Proof. Use Lemma 3.12 to find two tubes $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ whose coaxial lines are $\geq \delta^{C_1 \varepsilon}$ separated and skew, so that the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_1$ covers $\mathcal{T}_2$ with error $\leq \delta^{C_1 \varepsilon}$ and there are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2}$ pairs

$$\begin{aligned} \{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_3) \colon \mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2),\ \mathcal{T}_3 \in H(\mathcal{T}),\ \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_3 \subset N_{\delta^{-C_1 \varepsilon}\theta}(R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)), \\ \angle(v(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_p R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)) \geq \delta^{C_1 \varepsilon} \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{T}_3 \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where C_1 is an absolute constant. Refining the above set slightly and increasing C_1 if necessary, we can also ensure that $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_3$ are $\geq \delta^{C_1 \varepsilon}$ separated and skew, and that $v(\mathcal{T}_3)$ makes an angle $\geq \delta^{C_1 \varepsilon}$ with the plane spanned by $v(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $v(\mathcal{T}_2)$. In particular, this means that $R_{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3}$ is a $\delta^{C_1 \varepsilon}$ non-degenerate regulus.

[4]Of course this statement is only interesting if θ^2 is much larger than δ; otherwise we obtain an incidence arrangement with only one point and one line

After pigeonholing, we can select a set $\mathbb{T}' \subset \mathbb{T}$ so that each tube $\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}'$ is present in $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2}|\mathbb{T}'|^{-1}$ pairs $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_3)$. For each $\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}'$, consider the set

$$Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3) = Y(\mathcal{T}_3) \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\colon (\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}_3)\in(5.2)} Y(\mathcal{T}).$$

(Note that $|Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3)|$ is much smaller than $|Y(\mathcal{T}_3)|$!). Since $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_3),\ T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ at every point $p \in \mathcal{T}_3 \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2)$, we have that $Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3)$ is contained in a union of two tube segments, each of length $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \theta$. Our next step will be to apply a two-ends reduction: For each $\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}'$, there is a ball $B(p_{\mathcal{T}_3}, s_{\mathcal{T}_3})$ so that

$$|Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3) \cap B(x_{\mathcal{T}_3}, s_{\mathcal{T}_3})| \geq \delta^\varepsilon |Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3)|,$$

and for each $0 < r \leq 1$ and each p', we have

$$|Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3) \cap B(p', r s_{\mathcal{T}_3})| \leq r^\varepsilon |Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3) \cap B(p_{\mathcal{T}_3}, s_{\mathcal{T}_3})|. \tag{5.3}$$

After pigeonholing (which induces a refinement of $\mathbb{T}'$), we can assume that there is a number s so that $s_{\mathcal{T}_3} \sim s$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}'$. Define the set of "good pairs,"

$$GP = \{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_3)\colon Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y_1(\mathcal{T}_3) \cap B(p_{\mathcal{T}_3}, s) \neq \emptyset\}, \tag{5.4}$$

where $B(p_{\mathcal{T}_3}, s)$ is the ball arising from the two-ends reduction. We have $|GP| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2}$.

Since $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is of Heisenberg type with parameter α and $C\varepsilon$, if we choose the constant C from the statement of Proposition 5.1 to be larger than C_1, then at most $\delta^{-1/2+\alpha}$ tubes from $\mathbb{T}$ can be contained in any $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ regulus strip. Note that $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$ tubes intersect each of $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_3$ and are contained in the s neighborhood of a line. We can cover this set of tubes by a set of $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ non-degenerate regulus strips of size $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}s$, so that each of these tubes is contained in at least one strip. Since at most $\delta^{-1/2+\alpha}$ tubes can be contained in any $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ non-degenerate regulus strip, we conclude that $s \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2-\alpha}$. □

In the following lemma we will continue the process of constructing a planar point-line arrangement with many incidences.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be a ε–extremal set of tubes of Heisenberg type with parameter α. Then there is a number $\tilde{\delta} \leq \delta^\alpha$, a set $\mathcal{P} \subset B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of points, and a set $\mathcal{L}$ of lines in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the following properties:*

- $|\mathcal{P}| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$, $|\mathcal{L}| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$.
- *For each ball $B(x,r) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,*
$$|\mathcal{P} \cap B(x,r)| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} r\tilde{\delta}^{-1}. \tag{5.5}$$
- *For each $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ and each $1 \leq N \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$,*
$$|\{L \in \mathcal{L}\colon \operatorname{dist}(L, p_i) \leq N\tilde{\delta},\ i = 1,2\}| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} N/\operatorname{dist}(p_1,p_2). \tag{5.6}$$
- *There is a constant C so that for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$,*
$$|\{(p_1,p_2) \in \mathcal{P}^2\colon \operatorname{dist}(p_1,p_2) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon},\ \operatorname{dist}(L,p_i) \leq \tilde{\delta},\ i = 1,2\}| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}. \tag{5.7}$$

Remark 5.1. When proving point-line incidence theorems, we can use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the observation that at most one line passes through each pair of points to show that N points and N lines determine at most $O(N^{3/2})$ incidences.

If the points and lines satisfy (5.5) and (5.6), then a similar argument can be used to bound the number of $\tilde{\delta}$–close pairs of points and lines. Thus the lower bound from (5.7) matches the upper bound given by Cauchy-Schwarz. As we will see later, a stronger upper bound actually holds, which leads to a contradiction.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Apply Lemma 5.1 to $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ and let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2,\ (\mathbb{T}', Y')$ and s be the output from that lemma. Recall that because we have $\mathcal{T} \in H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)$ whenever $\mathcal{T}_3 \in H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T})$, we have

$$|\{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_3) \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \times \mathbb{T}' \colon \mathcal{T} \in H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2}.$$

Since $|H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1}$, we can use pigeonholing to select a tube $\mathcal{T}_A \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ with

$$|\{\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}' \colon \mathcal{T}_A \in H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}.$$

Observe that if $\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}'$, $\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$, and if $\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T} \in H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)$, then both $\mathcal{T}_A$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are incident to the three tubes $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3$, which are pairwise $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew. By Lemma 2.4, $\mathcal{T}_A$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are uniformly separated (actually s' separated for some $s' \le s$) with error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ and $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew.

Let

$$\mathbb{T}_{12} = \{\mathcal{T} \in H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \colon \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}_A \text{ are } \ge \delta^{C_1\varepsilon} \text{ skew and } s \text{ separated with error } \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}\}. \tag{5.8}$$

By the third item in the conclusion of Lemma 5.1, we have that that if C_1 is selected sufficiently large then for each $\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}' \cap H(\mathcal{T}_A)$, all of the tubes in $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \cap H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)$ are contained in $B_{\delta^{-C_1\varepsilon}s}(\mathcal{T}_A)$, and at most half of the tubes in $H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \cap H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)$ are contained in $B_{\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}s}(\mathcal{T}_A)$.

Thus if C_1 is selected sufficiently large in (5.8), then for each $\mathcal{T}_3 \in H(\mathcal{T}_A) \cap \mathbb{T}'$ we have

$$|H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3) \cap \mathbb{T}_{12}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2} |\mathbb{T}'|^{-1} \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}.$$

By Lemma 3.14, for each $\mathcal{T}_3 \in H(\mathcal{T}_A) \cap \mathbb{T}'$, there is a set of $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$ tubes $\mathcal{T}' \in H_{Y'}(\mathcal{T}_3)$ with $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}'),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3}) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ at every point $p \in \mathcal{T}' \cap \mathcal{T}_3$. Thus by pigeonholing, we can select a tube $\mathcal{T}_B \in \mathbb{T}$ so that there are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1}$ tubes $\mathcal{T}_3 \in H'(\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B) \cap \mathbb{T}'$ satisfying

$$\angle\big(v(\mathcal{T}_B),\ T_p R_{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3}\big) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1 \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathcal{T}_3 \cap \mathcal{T}_B. \tag{5.9}$$

Call this set of tubes $\mathbb{T}''$.

Let $1 \le N \le \delta^{-1}$ and let $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T}_{12}$ and suppose there exits at least one tube $\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}''$ that intersects the $N\delta$-neighborhood of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$. Suppose that these points of intersection are $\ge \delta^{1-C\varepsilon} N$ separated, where C is a constant that depends only on the separation and skewness of $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_3$. In particular, this implies that $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ skew and $\approx_\varepsilon q$ separated with error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ for some q satisfying $N\delta \le q \le s$.

Since $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$, and $\mathcal{T}_3$ are $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew, and $v(\mathcal{T}_3)$ makes an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ with the plane spanned by $v(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $v(\mathcal{T}_2)$, we can apply Lemma 2.8. Let Q be the monic degree-two polynomial that vanishes on the three lines coxial with $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$, and $\mathcal{T}_3$. Since there are three $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ separated points on $\mathcal{T}_A$ that are δ–close to $Z(Q)$, we have that the restriction of Q to the δ neighborhood of $\mathcal{T}$ has magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$. Similarly, the restriction of Q to the $N\delta$ neighborhood of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ has magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon N\delta$. Now let $\mathcal{T}_3'$ be a tube that intersects $\mathcal{T}_A$ and also intersects the $N\delta$ neighborhoods of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$. Then if we restrict Q to the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_3'$, this univariate

polynomial has magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon N\delta$ at three points, which have separation q and s. Thus by Lagrange interpolation, the restriction of Q to the line concentric with $\mathcal{T}_3'$ has magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon N\delta/sq$. Since $|\nabla Q| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ on $B(0,1) \cap Z(Q)$, we conclude that $\mathcal{T}_3'$ is contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon N\delta/sq$–neighborhood of $Z(Q)$.

Now consider the set

$$\{\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}'' \colon \mathcal{T}_3 \cap N_{N\delta}(\mathcal{T}) \neq \emptyset,\ \mathcal{T}_3 \cap N_{N\delta}(\mathcal{T}') \neq \emptyset\}. \tag{5.10}$$

Since the tubes in (5.10) are contained in $H'(\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B)$, we have that the intersections of these tubes with $\mathcal{T}_B$ must be $\lesssim 1$ overlapping. The tubes in (5.10) are also contained in the $\approx_\varepsilon N\delta/sq$ neighborhood of the regulus $R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3'}$, where $\mathcal{T}_3'$ is any tube in $\mathbb{T}''$ that intersects $N_{N\delta}(\mathcal{T}_A)$, $N_{N\delta}(\mathcal{T})$, and $N_{N\delta}(\mathcal{T}')$ (if no such tube exists then (5.10) is empty, which is good for us). Finally, the tubes in this set must intersect $\mathcal{T}_B$, and $\mathcal{T}_B$ makes an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ with the tangent plane of $R_{\mathcal{T}_1,\mathcal{T}_2,\mathcal{T}_3'}$ at every point of intersection. At most $\lessapprox_\varepsilon N/sq$ tubes from $\mathbb{T}'$ can satisfy these three properties, so

$$|(5.10)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon N/sq.$$

Let $\mathbb{T}_{AB}$ be a random s^2 refinement of the set of tubes from $\mathbb{T}''$; this refinement can be obtained by randomly selecting each tube with probability s^2. Then with high probability, $|\mathbb{T}_{AB}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1}s^2$ and for each $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T}_{12}$ that are q separated with error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$, we have

$$|\{\mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}_{AB} \colon \operatorname{dist}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_3) \leq N\delta,\ \operatorname{dist}(\mathcal{T}', \mathcal{T}_3) \leq N\delta\}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon Ns/q.$$

After applying a linear transformation that distorts angles by a factor of $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$, we can assume that the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1$ is the line $(0,0,0) + \mathbb{R}(1,0,0)$, the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_2$ is the line $(0,0,1) + \mathbb{R}(0,1,0)$, and the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_A$ is the line $(0,0,0) + \mathbb{R}(0,0,1)$. After applying this transformation, the original tubes from $\mathbb{T}$ might be slightly distorted and thus might no longer be 'tubes" according to the definition given in Section 1, but nonetheless each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ will contain the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhood of a line segment of length $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ and will be contained in the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhood of a line segment of length $\approx_\varepsilon 1$. We will abuse notation slightly and refer to these objects as tubes, since they will still obey all of the estimates discussed above.

We will now construct the set $\mathcal{P}$. Recall $\mathbb{T}_{12} \subset H'(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$, so in particular the sets $\{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \colon \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{12}\}$ are $\lesssim 1$ overlapping. Let $\mathbb{T}_{12}'$ be a subset of $\mathbb{T}_{12}$ of size $\approx_\varepsilon s|\mathbb{T}_{12}| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1}s^2$ so that the sets $\{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \colon \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{12}'\}$ are $\geq \delta/s$ separated. For each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{12}'$, $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_1$ is contained in a ball of radius $\approx_\varepsilon \delta$ centered at a point of the form $(x,0,0)$ and $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_2$ is contained in a ball of radius $\approx_\varepsilon \delta$ centered at a point of the form $(0,y,1)$. By (5.8), $|x|, |y| \approx_\varepsilon s$. Define

$$\phi(\mathcal{T}) = (s/x, s/y).$$

Let $\tilde{\delta} = \delta/s^2$, so in particular $\tilde{\delta} \leq \delta^\alpha$.

Remark 5.2. If $A \leq \delta^{-C\varepsilon}B$, then $A \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-C\varepsilon/\alpha}B$. Thus we will frequently see the expression $A \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} B$.

Define $\mathcal{P} = \phi(\mathbb{T}_{12}')$. This is a set of $\tilde{\delta}^{-1}$ points that are $\tilde{\delta}$–separated and contained in a ball centered at the origin of radius $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$. Since the sets $\{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \colon \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{12}'\}$ are $\geq \delta/s$ separated, we have

$$|B(x,r) \cap \mathcal{P}| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} r|\mathcal{P}|. \tag{5.11}$$

Next, we will construct the set $\mathcal{L}$. If $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{AB}$, then $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_A$ is contained in a ball of radius $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$ centered at the point $(0,0,z)$, and the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}$ has the form $(-az, -bz, 0) + \mathbb{R}(a,b,1)$, with $|a|,\ |b| \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$. Let

$$\psi(\mathcal{T}) = \Big(\frac{bz-b}{s},\ \frac{az}{s}\Big),$$

and let $\check{\psi}(\mathcal{T})$ be the line dual to $\psi(\mathcal{T})$. Define $\mathcal{L} = \check{\psi}(\mathbb{T}_{AB})$.

Now, suppose that $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{12}$ and $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T}_{AB}$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{T} = \{(1-t)x, ty, t),\ t \in \mathbb{R}\} + O(\delta),$$
$$\mathcal{T}' = \{(a(t-z), b(t-z), t) \colon t \in \mathbb{R}\} + O(\delta).$$

And suppose furthermore that $\operatorname{dist}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \sim N\delta$ for some $1 \leq N \leq \delta^{-1}$. Then we must have

$$(1-t)x - a(t-z) = \Theta(N\delta), \quad \text{and} \quad ty - b(t-z) = \Theta(N\delta).$$

Re-arranging, we conclude

$$t = \frac{bz + \Theta(N\delta)}{b-y},$$

and thus

$$a\big(bz + \Theta(\delta) - z(b-y)\big) = \big((b-y) - bz + \Theta(N\delta)\big)x,$$

i.e.

$$a\big(bz - z(b-y)\big) - \big((b-y) - bz\big)x = \Theta(N\delta), \quad \text{and} \quad xy + (bz-b)x + azy = \Theta(\delta).$$

Since $x, y \approx_\varepsilon$, can divide by zy and obtain

$$\Big|1 + \Big(\frac{bz-b}{s}\Big)\Big(\frac{s}{y}\Big) + \Big(\frac{az}{s}\Big)\Big(\frac{s}{x}\Big)\Big| \approx_\varepsilon N\delta s^{-2} = N\tilde{\delta}.$$

This is exactly the statement that $\operatorname{dist}(\psi(\mathcal{T}), \check{\phi}(\mathcal{T}')) \approx_\varepsilon N\tilde{\delta}$. This implies (5.6) and (5.7). After dilating $\mathbb{R}^2$ by a factor of $\lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} 1$, we can assume that $\mathcal{P} \subset B(0,1)$.

We conclude: $\mathcal{P} \subset B(0,1)$ is a set of $\approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$ points that satisfies (5.5), and $\mathcal{L}$ is a set of $\approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$ lines that satisfies (5.6). Furthermore, if the constant C is selected sufficiently large, then for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$, there are $\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$ pairs $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $\operatorname{dist}(p_1, p_2) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon/\alpha}$, $\operatorname{dist}(p_1, L) \leq \tilde{\delta}$, and $\operatorname{dist}(p_2, L) \leq \tilde{\delta}$. □

5.2 Establishing non-concentration of the points

Recall that the set of points from the previous section satisfies the non-concentration estimate

$$|\mathcal{P} \cap B(x,r)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon r|\mathcal{P}|. \tag{5.12}$$

Using standard arguments, will find a projective transformation T to so that $T(\mathcal{P})$ has large intersection with a Cartesian product $S_1 \times S_2$, where S_1 and S_2 each have cardinality roughly $\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$. This will be done in Lemma 5.3.

Even though the set $S_1 \times S_2$ still satisfies (5.12), this does not imply that the sets S_1 or S_2 individually satisfy any non-concentration estimates. For example, we might have $S_1 = [0, \tilde{\delta}^{1/2}] \cap \tilde{\delta}\mathbb{Z}$ and $S_2 = [0,1] \cap \tilde{\delta}^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$.

In this section, we will show that because the lines also satisfy a non-concentration estimate, this forces the sets S_1 and S_2 to satisfy a non-concentration estimate as well.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}$, and $\tilde{\delta}$ satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 5.2. Then there exist sets $A, B \subset [0,1]$, a set $\mathcal{P}' \subset A \times B$, and a set $G \subset B \times B$ so that*

- $|A|, |B| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$.

- $|\mathcal{P}'| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$.
- *For each ball* $B(x,r) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,
$$|\mathcal{P}' \cap B(x,r)| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} r\tilde{\delta}^{-1}. \tag{5.13}$$
- $|G| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$.
- *For every* $b_1 \in B$, $|(\{b_1\} \times B) \cap G| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$.
- *For every* $p \in \mathcal{P}$, *there exist* $(b_1, b_2) \in G$ *so that the three points* p, $(0, b_1)$, *and* $(1, b_2)$ *are contained in the* $\tilde{\delta}$*–neighborhood of a line (this line need not be an element of* $\mathcal{L}$*).*
- *For every two intervals* $I_1, I_2 \subset [0,1]$,
$$|G \cap (I_1 \times I_2)| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \max(|I_1|, |I_2|)\tilde{\delta}^{-1}. \tag{5.14}$$
- *For each* $(b_1, b_2) \in G$, *if* L *is the line connecting* $(0, b_1)$ *to* $(1, b_2)$, *then*
$$|\{(p_1,p_2) \in (\mathcal{P}')^2 \colon \operatorname{dist}(p_1,p_2) \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C\varepsilon},\ \operatorname{dist}(p_i, L) \leq \tilde{\delta},\ i = 1,2,\}| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}.$$

Proof. The basic idea is that we will trap most of the points from $\mathcal{P}$ in the "bush" of two points p_1 and p_2. We will then apply a linear transformation sending lines through p_1 to vertical lines, and lines through p_2 to horizontal lines. Under this transformation, $\mathcal{P}$ is mapped to a Cartesian product.

For each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, define

$$H(p) = \{p' \in \mathcal{P} \colon \operatorname{dist}(p,p') \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C\varepsilon/\alpha},\ \text{there exists } L \in \mathcal{L} \text{ with } \operatorname{dist}(p,L) \leq \tilde{\delta},\ \operatorname{dist}(p',L) \leq \tilde{\delta}\}.$$

Discard all lines $L \in \mathcal{L}$ that have fewer than $\tilde{\delta}^{-1+C\varepsilon/\alpha}$ pairs of incident points, where C is a large constant. This guarantees us that for each p, there are at most $\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}-C\varepsilon/\alpha}$ lines accounting for all but a small fraction of the points of any $H(p)$. If the constant C is chosen sufficiently large, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} |H(p)| &= \sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}} |\{(p_1,p_2) \in \mathcal{P}^2 \colon \operatorname{dist}(p_1,p_2) \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C\varepsilon/\alpha},\ \operatorname{dist}(p_1,L) \leq \tilde{\delta},\ \operatorname{dist}(p_2,L) \leq \tilde{\delta}\}| \\ &\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-2} \\ &\approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} |\mathcal{P}|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus by pigeonholing, there exist points p_1, p_2 so that $\operatorname{dist}(p_1,p_2) \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C\varepsilon/\alpha}$ and $|\mathcal{P} \cap H(p_1) \cap H(p_2)| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$. If necessary, prune the set of lines incident to p_1 and p_2 so that there are $\leq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$ lines incident to each of p_1 and p_2; we still have $|\mathcal{P} \cap H(p_1) \cap H(p_2)| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$.

Select a ball B with $\operatorname{dist}(B,p_1) \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C_1\varepsilon/\alpha}$, $\operatorname{dist}(B,p_2) \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C_1\varepsilon/\alpha}$, and $|\mathcal{P} \cap H(p_1) \cap H(p_2) \cap B| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$. If C_1 is chosen sufficiently large then such a ball must exist. Define $\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P} \cap H(p_1) \cap H(p_2) \cap B$. Let φ be a projective transformation sending points through p_1 to vertical lines and points through p_2 to horizontal lines. Define $\mathcal{P}_2 = \varphi(\mathcal{P}_1)$; this set is contained in a Cartesian product $A \times B$, with $|A| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$, $|B| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$.

For each ball $B(x,r) \subset B$ we have that $\varphi(B(x,r))$ is contained in a ball of radius $\lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} r$ and contains a ball of radius $\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} r$. Thus for each ball $B(x,r)$ we have

$$|B(x,r) \cap \mathcal{P}_2| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} r|\mathcal{P}_2|.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \{\varphi(L) \colon L \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

Inequality (5.6) still holds.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that

- $0, 1 \in A$.
- $|\mathcal{P}_2 \cap (\{0\} \times B)| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$.
- $|\mathcal{P}_2 \cap (\{1\} \times B)| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$.
- For every $p_1 = (0, b_1)$, there are $\gtrsim_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$ points of the form $p_2 = (1, b_2) \in \mathcal{P}_2$ so that there is a line $L \in \mathcal{L}_1$ that is $\tilde{\delta}$–incident to p_1 and p_2.

Indeed, the second, third, and fourth properties above hold for $\gtrsim_{\varepsilon/\alpha} |A|^2$ pairs $(x_1, x_2) \in A^2$ that satisfy $\operatorname{dist}(x_1, x_2) \gtrsim_{\varepsilon/\alpha} 1$. Select one of these pairs (x_1, x_2) and apply an affine transformation sending the line $\{x_1\} \times \mathbb{R}$ to $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and the line $\{x_2\} \times \mathbb{R}$ to $\{1\} \times \mathbb{R}$.

We can refine $\mathcal{L}_1$ so that every $L \in \mathcal{L}_1$ is incident to a point of the form $(0, b_1)$ and a point $(1, b_2)$. Thus we can identify $\mathcal{L}_1$ with a subset $G \subset B \times B$. We have $|G| \gtrsim_{\varepsilon/\alpha} |B \times B| \approx_{\varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$. Finally discard all points from $\mathcal{P}_2$ that do not satisfy $\operatorname{dist}(p, L) \leq \tilde{\delta}$ for some L in (the refined version of) $\mathcal{L}_1$.

The final thing to verify is (5.14), but this is just a re-statement of (5.6). □

The set $\mathcal{P}' \subset A \times B$ from Lemma 5.3 satisfies the non-concentration property $|\mathcal{P}' \cap B(x, r)| \lesssim_{\varepsilon/\alpha} r\tilde{\delta}^{-1}$. Next, we will show that the set B satisfies a similar type of non-concentration property. In Lemma 5.4 we will establish non-concentration at a single scale, and we will use this result in Lemma 5.5 to establish non-concentration at every scale.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $B \subset [0,1]$ be a set of $\tilde{\delta}$–separated points, with $\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2+\varepsilon} \leq |B| \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$. Let $G \subset B \times B$ with $|G| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{-1+\varepsilon}$. Suppose that for all intervals $I_1, I_2 \subset [0,1]$, we have*

$$|G \cap (I_1 \times I_2)| \leq K \max(|I_1|, |I_2|)\tilde{\delta}^{-1}$$

for some $K > 0$. Suppose as well that for all intervals $I \subset [0,1]$ of length $\leq r_0$, we have

$$|B \cap I| \leq |I|^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}.$$

Then there exists a set $B' \subset B$ with $|B'| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{3\varepsilon}|B|$ so that for all intervals $J \subset [0,1]$ of length $|J| \leq \min(\tilde{\delta}^{\varepsilon}, r_0^{1/50})$,

$$|J \cap B'| \leq K|J|^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}. \tag{5.15}$$

Proof. First, select $B_1 \subset B$ so that $|B_1| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{\varepsilon}|B|$ and

$$|(\{b\} \times [0,1]) \cap G| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2-2\varepsilon}$$

for all $b \in B_1$. Let $I \subset [0,1]$ be the shortest interval for which $|I \cap B_1| \geq |I|^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$. We know that $|I| \geq r_0$. If $|I| \geq r_0^{1/50}$ or if no such interval exists, then we let $B' = B_1$ and we are done.

Henceforth we can assume that $|I| \leq r_0^{1/50}$. Let $B' \subset B$ be the set of all $b \in B$ with

$$|((B_1 \cap I) \times \{b\}) \cap G| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{3\varepsilon}|B_1 \cap I|.$$

We have $|B'| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{\varepsilon}|B| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2+2\varepsilon}$.

Let $J \subset [0,1]$ be any interval satisfying $|I| \leq |J| \leq \min(\tilde{\delta}^{\varepsilon}, r_0^{1/50})$. We have

$$|G \cap (I \times J)| \geq \big(\tilde{\delta}^{3\varepsilon}|B_1 \cap I|\big)\big(|B' \cap J|\big) \geq r_0^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2+3\varepsilon}|B' \cap J|, \tag{5.16}$$

and

$$|G \cap (I \times J)| \leq K \max(|I|,|J|)\tilde{\delta}^{-1} = K|J|\tilde{\delta}^{-1}. \tag{5.17}$$

Combing (5.16) and (5.17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |J \cap B'| &\leq K|J| r_0^{-1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2-3\varepsilon} \\ &\leq K|J|^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}(|J|^{99/100} r_0^{-1/100}) \\ &\leq K|J|^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}(r_0^{99/5000-1/100}) \\ &\leq K|J|^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We will now use the preceding lemma to show that the set B is non-concentrated at every scale.

Lemma 5.5. *For every $\tau > 0$, there exists a constant C so that the following holds:*

Let $B \subset [0,1]$ be a set of $\tilde{\delta}$–separated points, with $\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2+\varepsilon} \leq |B| \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$. Let $G \subset B \times B$ with $|G| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{-1+\varepsilon}$. Suppose that for all intervals $I_1, I_2 \subset [0,1]$, we have

$$|G \cap (I_1 \times I_2)| \leq K \max(|I_1|,|I_2|)\tilde{\delta}^{-1}.$$

Then there is a set $B' \subset B$ with $|B'| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2+C\varepsilon}$ so that for all intervals $I \subset [0,1]$ with $|I| \leq \min(\tilde{\delta}^{C\varepsilon}, \tilde{\delta}^{\tau})$, we have

$$|B \cap I| \leq K|I|^{1/100}\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}. \tag{5.18}$$

Proof. Let $N = \lceil |\log_{50} \tau| \rceil$, and let $C = 3^N$. Apply Lemma 5.4 N times, and let B' be the resulting set. Observe that after the k–th application of Lemma 5.4, we obtain a set B_k with $\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2+3^k\varepsilon} \leq |B_k| \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$, and

$$|B_k \cap J| \leq K|J|^{1/100}|B_k|$$

for all intervals J of length $|J| \leq \min(\tilde{\delta}^{\varepsilon 3^k}, \tilde{\delta}^{1/50^k})$. Thus after N applications of Lemma 5.4, we obtain a set B_N with $\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2-C\varepsilon} \leq |B_N| \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$, and

$$|B_N \cap J| \leq K|J|^{1/100}|B_k|$$

for all intervals J of length $|J| \leq \min(\tilde{\delta}^{C\varepsilon}, \tilde{\delta}^{\tau})$. Let $B' = B_N$. □

Applying Lemma 5.5 to the output from Lemma 5.3 with $K \lessapprox_{\varepsilon/\alpha} 1$, we obtain the following:

Lemma 5.6. *There is a constant C so that the following holds. Let $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of Heisenberg type (with parameter α and $C\varepsilon$). Then there is a number $\tilde{\delta} \geq \delta^{\alpha}$ so that: for all $\tau > 0$, there exists a constant τ, sets of points $B' \subset [0,1]$, $\mathcal{P} \subset B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, and a set of lines $\mathcal{L}$ with the following properties.*

- $|\mathcal{P}| \approx_{C_\tau \varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$.
- *For each ball $B(x,r) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$|\mathcal{P} \cap B(x,r)| \lessapprox_{C_\tau \varepsilon/\alpha} r\tilde{\delta}^{-1}. \tag{5.19}$$

- $|B'| \approx_{C_\tau \varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$.
- *For every interval I of length $\tilde{\delta} \leq |I| \leq \tilde{\delta}^\tau$,*

$$|B' \cap I| \lessapprox_{C_\tau \varepsilon/\alpha} |I|^{1/100} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}. \tag{5.20}$$

- *Each $L \in \mathcal{L}$ is incident to a point $(b_0, 0)$ and $(b_1, 1)$ with $b_0, b_1 \in B'$. For each line $L \in \mathcal{L}$, we have*

$$|\{p \in \mathcal{P} \colon \operatorname{dist}(L, p) \leq \tilde{\delta}\}| \gtrapprox_{C_\tau \varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}' \subset A \times B$ and $G \subset B \times B$ be the output obtained by applying Lemma 5.3 to the collection $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$. Apply Lemma 5.5 to B and G with the value of τ specified in the statement of Lemma 5.6, and let B' be the resulting subset of B. Let $\mathcal{L} = G \cap (B' \times B')$, where we identify the pair (b_1, b_2) with the line passing though the points $(0, b_1)$ and $(1, b_2)$.

All of the required properties of the sets B', $\mathcal{P}$, and $\mathcal{L}$ follow from the conclusions of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.5. □

5.3 Reduction to Bourgain's discretized projection theorem

We will now perform a reduction that transforms the output of Lemma 5.6 into the input for Bourgain's discretized projection theorem.

Apply a projective transformation ϕ that sends the line $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ to the line at infinity (we will assume that for at least half the incidences $\{(p, L) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{L},\ d(p, L) \leq \tilde{\delta}\}$, the x–coordinate of p is $\geq 1/2$. If not, we can apply a projective transformation that sends the line $\{1\} \times \mathbb{R}$ to the line at infinity instead). Let $\Theta \subset S^1$ be the image of B under this transformation. We have that $|\Theta| \gtrapprox_{C_\tau \varepsilon/\alpha} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$, so in particular $|\Theta| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{-1/3}$. Furthermore, for each interval I of length $\tilde{\delta} \leq r \leq \delta^\tau$ we have

$$|\Theta \cap I| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon_1} |I|^{1/100} |\Theta|, \tag{5.21}$$

where

$$\varepsilon_1 = C_\tau \varepsilon / \alpha. \tag{5.22}$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_1 = \phi\big(\mathcal{P} \cap ([1/2, 1] \times [0, 1])\big)$, and let $\mathcal{L}_1 = \{\phi(L) \colon L \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Observe that the direction of each line in $\mathcal{L}_1$ is equal to one of the directions in the set Θ. For each $\theta \in \Theta$, let

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \{L \in \mathcal{L}_1 \colon L \text{ point in direction } \theta\}.$$

For each $p \in \mathcal{P}_1$, define

$$\mathcal{L}(p) = \{L \in \mathcal{L}_1 \colon \operatorname{dist}(p, L) \leq \tilde{\delta}\}.$$

For each $L \in \mathcal{L}_1$, define

$$\mathcal{P}(L) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_1 \colon \operatorname{dist}(p, L) \leq \tilde{\delta}\}.$$

For each $\theta \in \Theta$, define

$$\mathcal{P}(\theta) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}(\theta)} \mathcal{P}(L).$$

Define

$$I_{\tilde{\delta}}(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{L}_1) = \{(p, L) \in \mathcal{P}_1 \times \mathcal{L}_1 \colon \operatorname{dist}(p, L) \leq \tilde{\delta}\}.$$

Select $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3 \in \Theta$ that are pairwise $\gtrsim_{\varepsilon_1} 1$-separated so that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(\theta_1) \cap \mathcal{P}(\theta_2) \cap \mathcal{P}(\theta_3)} |\mathcal{L}(p)| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-3/2}.$$

(We can use (5.21) and a pigeonholing argument to guarantee that such a choice of θ_1, θ_2, and θ_3 exist). Let $\mathcal{P}_2$ be the image of $\mathcal{P}(\theta_1) \cap \mathcal{P}(\theta_2) \cap \mathcal{P}(\theta_3)$ under the linear transformation sending θ_1 to the vertical direction and θ_2 to the horizontal direction. Let $\mathcal{L}_2$ be the image of $\mathcal{L}_1$ under this transformation and let Θ_1 be the image of Θ under this transformation (the transformation has determinant $\approx_\varepsilon 1$ and distorts angles by a factor of $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$, so (5.21) still holds for Θ_1).

Then $\mathcal{P}_2 \subset A \times B$, where $|A| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$, $|B| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$, and the sets A and B are $\tilde{\delta}$-separated. Let λ be the angle associated to (the image of) θ_2, so $\tilde{\delta}^{C_2\varepsilon_1} \leq \lambda \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-C_2\varepsilon_1}$ for some absolute constant C_2.

We will now refine the sets A and B slightly to increase the separation between the points. Let C_2 be a constant to be determined later. We can find a refinement $A_1 \subset A,\ B_1 \subset B$ and a set $\mathcal{P}_3 \subset \mathcal{P}_2 \cap (A_1 \times B_1)$ so that the points in A_1 and A_2 are $\tilde{\delta}^{1-C_2\varepsilon_1}$ separated; $|\mathcal{P}_3| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$; for each $p \in \mathcal{P}_3,\ |\mathcal{L}(p)| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$; and

$$|I_{\tilde{\delta}}(\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{L}(\theta_2))| \gtrapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}. \tag{5.23}$$

We can identify $\tilde{\delta}^{-1}A_1$ and $\tilde{\delta}^{-1}\lambda B_1$ with subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ by rounding each element of $\tilde{\delta}^{-1}A_1$ and $\tilde{\delta}^{-1}\lambda B_1$ to the closest integer—call these sets $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{B}_1$. Since A_1 is $\geq \tilde{\delta}$ separated, the map from A_1 to $\hat{A}_1$ is injective (or to be pedantic, it's at most two-to-one), and since B_1 is $\tilde{\delta}^{1-C_2\varepsilon_1}$–separated and $\lambda \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C_2\varepsilon_1}$, the map from B_1 to $\hat{B}_1$ is injective (again, at most two-to-one).

With this identification, we have that $|\hat{A}_1| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$ and $|\hat{B}_1| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$. By (5.23), Cauchy-Schwarz, and the fact that $|\mathcal{L}(\theta_2)| \lessapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$, there are $\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-3/2}$ solutions to the equation

$$\{a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2 \colon a_1, a_2 \in \hat{A}_1,\ b_1, b_2 \in \hat{B}_1\}. \tag{5.24}$$

Indeed, there are $\approx_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$ lines in $\mathcal{L}(\theta_2)$ that are incident to $\approx_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$ points from $\mathcal{P}_3$, and if $(x_1, y_1),\ (x_2, y_2) \in \mathcal{P}_3$ are incident to the same line, then $|x_1 + \lambda y_1 - (x_2 + \lambda y_2)| \leq \tilde{\delta}$. Note that $\tilde{\delta}^{C_2\varepsilon_1} \leq \lambda \leq \tilde{\delta}^{-C_3\varepsilon_1}$, and thus if $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ are the points associated to x_1, y_1, x_2, and y_2 respectively, then $a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2$ (this is a slight lie, we actually have $|a_1 + b_1 - a_2 - b_2| \leq 4$, but by pigeonholing this only decreases the number of quadruples by a constant factor). Thus there are $\gtrapprox_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-3/2}$ such quadruples.

The next result allows us to find subsets of $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{B}_1$ that have small sum-set.

Theorem 5.1 (Balog-Szemerédi-Gowers theorem; [16], Theorem 2.31)**.** *Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose that*

$$|\{(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) \in A \times A \times B \times B \colon a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2\}| \geq K^{-1}|A|^{3/2}|B|^{3/2}.$$

Then there exist sets $A' \subset A,\ B' \subset B$ with $|A'| \geq K^{-C_1}|A|,\ |B'| \geq K^{-C_1}|B|$, and

$$d(A', B') \leq C_1 \log K,$$

where C_1 is an absolute constant and $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the Ruzsa distance.

We will not define the Ruzsa distance here. Instead, we will note that it is the input to the next theorem. For the interested reader, a definition of Ruzsa distance can be found in [16], Chapter 2.

Theorem 5.2 (Plünnecke-Ruzsa inequality; [16], Proposition 2.27)**.** *Let $A', B' \subset \mathbb{Z}$, and suppose that $d(A', B') \leq C_1 \log K$. Then there is a constant C_2 depending only on C_1 so that*

$$\begin{aligned} |A' + A'| &\leq K^{C_2}|A|, \\ |B' + B'| &\leq K^{C_2}|B|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

Applying Theorem 5.1 and then 5.2 with $K \lessapprox_{\varepsilon_1} 1$, we obtain sets $\hat{A}_2 \subset \hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{B}_2 \subset \hat{B}_1$ with

- $|\hat{A}_2| \gtrsim_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$,
- $|\hat{B}_2| \gtrsim_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$,
- $|\hat{A}_2 + \hat{A}_2| \lesssim_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$,
- $|\hat{B}_2 + \hat{B}_2| \lesssim_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2}$.

Let A_2 and B_2 be the subsets of $[0,1]$ associated to $\hat{A}_2$ and $\hat{B}_2$ under the maps $A_1 \to \hat{A}_1$ and $B_1 \to \hat{B}_1$ described above, and let $\mathcal{P}_4 = \mathcal{P}_3 \cap (A_2 \times B_2)$. Observe that for each $p \in \mathcal{P}_4$, $|\mathcal{L}(p)| \gtrsim_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1}$, so in particular

$$|I_{\tilde{\delta}}(\mathcal{P}_4, \mathcal{L}_1)| \gtrsim_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-3/2}. \tag{5.26}$$

Let

$$\Theta_2 = \{\theta \in \Theta_1 \colon I_{\tilde{\delta}}(\mathcal{L}(\theta), \mathcal{P}_4) \geq \tilde{\delta}^{-1+C_3\varepsilon_1}\}.$$

If we select C_3 sufficiently large then by (5.26), $|\Theta_2| \gtrsim_{\varepsilon_1} |\Theta|$, so Θ_2 still obeys (5.21).

Note that if $\theta \in \Theta_2$, then $|\mathcal{P}(\theta)| \geq \tilde{\delta}^{C_3\varepsilon_1}|\mathcal{P}|$, and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\delta}}\big(\pi_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\theta))\big) \leq |\mathcal{L}(\theta)| \lesssim_{\varepsilon_1} \tilde{\delta}^{-1/2},$$

where $\pi_\theta \colon \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is the orthogonal projection in the direction θ, and $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\delta}}(\cdot)$ is the $\tilde{\delta}$-covering number.

5.3.1 Bourgain's discretized projection theorem

The following result was proved by Bourgain [2]:

Theorem 5.3. *There exist absolute constants $s > 0, \tau > 0$, and $\rho_0 > 0$ so that the following holds for all $\rho \leq \rho_0$. Let $A, B \subset [0,1]$ be sets satisfying the following properties*

- $|A|, |B| \leq \rho^{-1/2-s}$.
- $\mathcal{E}_\rho(A + A) \leq \rho^{-1/2-s}$.
- $\mathcal{E}_\rho(B + B) \leq \rho^{-1/2-s}$.

Let $\mathcal{P} \subset A \times B$ with $|\mathcal{P}| \geq \rho^{-1+s}$ and suppose that for all balls B of radius $r \geq \rho$ we have

$$|B \cap \mathcal{P}| \leq r\rho^{-1-s}.$$

Let $\Theta \subset S^1$ be a set of points with $|\Theta| \geq \rho^{-1/4}$. Suppose that for all intervals I of length $\rho \leq r \leq \rho^\tau$, we have

$$|\Theta \cap I| \leq \rho^{-s}|I|^{1/100}|\Theta|.$$

Then there exists $\theta \in \Theta$ with the following property: if $\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{P}$ with $|\mathcal{P}'| \geq \rho^s|\mathcal{P}|$, then

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho(\pi_\theta(\mathcal{P}')) \geq \rho^{-1/2-s}.$$

Theorem 5.3 is a variant of Theorem 3 from [2]. It is stated in the above form as Remarks (i) and (iii) in [2, Section 7, p221]. The following table will aid the reader when translating between the notation of the present paper and [2].

[2]	Theorem 5.3
α	$1+O(s)$
κ	$1/100$
η	$1/2+s$
τ	τ
$\mathcal{B}$	$\mathcal{P}$
$\mathcal{A}'$	$\mathcal{P}'$

5.4 Concluding the proof

We are now ready to prove Proposition 5.1. For the reader's convenience, we re-state it here

Proposition 5.1. *There exist absolute constants C (large) and $c>0$ (small) so that the following holds. For every $\alpha>0$, there is a $\delta_0>0$ so that if $0<\delta\le\delta_0$, and if $(\mathbb{T},Y)$ is an ε–extremal collection of δ tubes that is of Heisenberg type with parameter α and $C\varepsilon$, then $\varepsilon>c\alpha$.*

Proof. Let s, τ, and ρ_0 be the constants from Theorem 5.3. Suppose that Proposition 5.1 was false. Then by Lemma 5.6, there is a number $\tilde{\delta}\le\delta^{1-2\alpha}$, a constant C_1 and sets $A,B\subset[0,1]$, $\mathcal{P},\Theta,\mathcal{L}$, that satisfy

- $|A|,|B|\le\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2-\varepsilon_2}$.
- $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\delta}}(A+A)\le\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2-\varepsilon_2}$.
- $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\delta}}(B+B)\le\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2-\varepsilon_2}$.
- $\mathcal{P}\subset A\times B$, $|\mathcal{P}|\ge\tilde{\delta}^{-1-\varepsilon_2}$.
- $|\Theta|\ge\tilde{\delta}^{-1/4}$, and if $I\subset S^1$ is an arc of length $\tilde{\delta}\le r\le\tilde{\delta}^{\tau}$, then
$$|I\cap\Theta|\le\tilde{\delta}^{-\varepsilon_2}|I|^{1/100}|\Theta|.$$
- For each $\theta\in\Theta$, there is a set $\mathcal{P}(\theta)\subset\mathcal{P}$ with $|\mathcal{P}(\theta)|\ge\tilde{\delta}^{\varepsilon_2}|\mathcal{P}|$ such that
$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\delta}}(\pi_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\theta)))\le\tilde{\delta}^{-1/2-\varepsilon_2}.$$

In the items above, $\varepsilon_2=C_\tau\varepsilon/\alpha$, where C_τ is a constant that depends on τ.

Let $c=s\alpha/C_\tau$. Then if $\varepsilon<c\alpha$, the sets $\mathcal{P},\Theta$, and $\mathcal{L}$ given above violate Theorem 5.3, provided $\tilde{\delta}\le\rho_0$, i.e. $\delta\le\delta_0=\rho_0^{1/\alpha}$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 5.1. □

6 Killing the SL_2 example

In this section we will show that an ε–extremal Besicovitch set of SL_2 type cannot exist. More precisely, we have the following.

Proposition 6.1. *For each constant C, there are positive constants $\alpha,\varepsilon_0,\delta_0$ so that if $0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0$ and $0<\delta\le\delta_0$, then there cannot exist an ε–extremal collection of δ tubes of SL_2 type with parameters α and $C\varepsilon$.*

First, we will record a minor observation that will help simplify notation. If $(\mathbb{T},Y)$ is an ε-extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type with parameters α and $C\varepsilon$, then $(\mathbb{T},Y)$ is also a $\max(\varepsilon,C\varepsilon,\alpha)$-extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type with parameters $\max(\varepsilon,C\varepsilon,\alpha)$ and $\max(\varepsilon,C\varepsilon,\alpha)$. Thus we can reduce Proposition 6.1 to the special case where $C=1$ and $\varepsilon=\alpha$. We will call such sets "ε–extremal collections of tubes of SL_2 type."

6.1 Regulus strips are well-separated

In this section we will show that after a refinement of $\mathcal{S}$, if $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are two regulus strips then the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of S_1 does not contain S_2, and vice-versa. This is a somewhat surprising statement, since the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of S_1 could contain as many as δ^{-1} tubes from $\mathbb{T}$ while still satisfying the Wolff axioms, so it could in theory contain as many as $\delta^{-1/2-\varepsilon}$ regulus strips.

Definition 6.1. *If S is a regulus strip, we define the direction of S to be the direction of the $\delta^{1/2}$-tube containing S. We denote this direction by $v(S)$. The vector $v(S)$ is defined up to uncertainty $O(\delta^{1/2})$.*

Let S_1 and S_2 be regulus strips with $\angle(v(S_1), v(S_2)) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$. If $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$, then the angle $\angle(T_p S_1, T_p S_2)$ is approximately constant, independent of the choice of $p \in S_1 \cap S_2$. More precisely, the angle can vary by $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Definition 6.2. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be a set of tubes of SL_2 type. We say that the regulus strips in $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ have tangential intersection (at angle t) if for all pairs $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying*

$$\angle(v(S_1), v(S_2)) \geq t,$$

we have

$$\angle\big(T_p S_1,\ T_p S_2\big) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2} \quad \text{for all } p \in \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_1)} Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_2)} Y(\mathcal{T}). \tag{6.1}$$

Note that this condition is only interesting if $\bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_1)} Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_2)} Y(\mathcal{T}) \neq \emptyset$. In practice, we will have $t = \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ for some absolute constant C.

Lemma 6.1 (Regulus strips are tangent whenever they intersect)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Then there is a constant C and a refinement $(\mathbb{T}, Y')$ so that the regulus strips in $(\mathbb{T}, Y')$ have tangential intersection at angle $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$.*

Proof. Apply Lemma 3.2 to $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ and let $(\mathbb{T}, Y_1)$ be the resulting refinement. For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, define the shading

$$Y_1(S) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S)} Y_1(\mathcal{T}).$$

Note that $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} |Y_1(S)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$, and that for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \chi_{Y_1(S)}(p) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}. \tag{6.2}$$

Cover each regulus strip $S \in \mathcal{S}$ by $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$ rectangular prisms of dimensions $\delta^{1/2} \times \delta^{1/2} \times \delta$. If W is one of these prisms, then W is comparable to the intersection of a ball of radius $\delta^{1/2}$ with the δ–neighborhood of a plane $\Pi(W)$. If $p \in S$ and if $W = W(p, S)$ is the prism containing p, then $\angle(T_p S, \Pi(W)) \lesssim \delta^{1/2}$.

Define the shading

$$Y_2(S) = \{p \in Y(S) \colon |Y_1(S) \cap W(p, S)| \geq \delta^{C_1\varepsilon+2}\}. \tag{6.3}$$

If C_1 is selected sufficiently large then $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} |Y_2(S)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$.

For each $\delta^{1/2} \leq t \leq 1$, define

$$A_t = \{(S_1, S_2) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \colon Y_2(S_1) \cap Y_2(S_2) \neq \emptyset,\ \angle(S_1, S_2) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon},\ t \leq \angle(T_p S_1, T_p S_2) < 2t\},$$

where C is a constant to be determined later. In the above definition, the point p is chosen in $S_1 \cap S_2$. Choosing a different p could change $\angle(T_pS_1, T_pS_2)$ by $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. For values of t close to $\delta^{1/2}$ this might change which of the above sets the pair (S_1, S_2) is assigned to, but this will not matter for our proof.

Since the tubes in $\mathbb{T}$ satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 3.2, we have that at least half the pairs of intersecting tubes make an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$. Thus if the constant C is chosen sufficiently large, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{t \text{ dyadic} \\ \delta^{1/2} \le t \le 1}} \sum_{(S_1,S_2)\in A_t} |Y_2(S_1) \cap Y_2(S_2)| \approx_\varepsilon \sum_{(S_1,S_2)\in \mathcal{S}^2} |Y_2(S_1) \cap Y_2(S_2)| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}.$$

After pigeonholing, there is a number t_0 so that

$$\sum_{(S_1,S_2)\in A_{t_0}} |Y_2(S_1) \cap Y_2(S_2)| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}. \tag{6.4}$$

We will show that $t_0 \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. We will do this by proving that the $\delta^{1/2}t_0$–neighborhood of most tubes in $\mathbb{T}$ has large intersection with $\bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T})$. This will mean that

$$\Big| \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T}) \Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon (\delta^{1/2}t_0)^{1/2},$$

and this contradicts the fact that $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is ε–extremal, unless $t_0 \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Observe that if $\angle(S_1,\ S_2) \ge \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ and $\angle(T_pS_1,\ T_pS_2) \approx_\varepsilon t_0$ for some point $p \in S_1 \cap S_2$, then $S_1 \cap S_2$ is contained in a rectangular prism of dimensions $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2} \times \delta t_0^{-1} \times \delta$, so $|S_1 \cap S_2| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{5/2} t_0^{-1}$.

Let $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathcal{S}$ be the set of strips $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\substack{S_2\in\mathcal{S} \\ (S_1,S_2)\in A_{t_0}}} |Y_2(S_1) \cap Y_2(S_2)| \ge \delta^{C_2\varepsilon - 1/2} |\mathcal{S}|^{-1}.$$

If the constant C_2 is selected sufficiently large, then $|\mathcal{S}_1| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$. Since each regulus strip $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ can contribute $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{5/2} t_0^{-1}$ to the above sum, we have that each regulus strip $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ intersects at least $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta / (\delta^{5/2} t_0^{-1}) = \delta^{-3/2} t_0$ other strips S_2 that satisfy $(S_1, S_2) \in A_{t_0}$. If $Y_2(S_1) \cap Y_2(S_2) \neq \emptyset$, and if $p_{S_1,S_2} \in S_1 \cap S_2$ is a point of intersection, then by (6.3),

$$|B(p_{S_1,S_2}, \delta^{1/2}) \cap Y_2(S_2)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^2.$$

Thus for each $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{S_2\in\mathcal{S} \\ (S_1,S_2)\in A_{t_0}}} |Y_2(S_2) \cap B(p_{S_1,S_2}, \delta^{1/2})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^2 (\delta^{-3/2} t_0^{-1}) = \delta^{1/2} t_0.$$

By (6.2), we have

$$\Big| \bigcup_{\substack{S_2\in\mathcal{S} \\ (S_1,S_2)\in A_{t_0}}} Y_2(S_2) \cap B(p_{S_1,S_2}, \delta^{1/2}) \Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta t_0.$$

But observe that the above set is contained in $N_{t_0\delta^{1/2}}(S_1)$, and $|N_{t_0\delta^{1/2}}(S_1)| \approx_\varepsilon \delta t_0$.

We conclude that

$$\Big| N_{t_0\delta^{1/2}}(S_1) \cap \bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} Y_2(S) \Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon |N_{t_0\delta^{1/2}}(S_1)|.$$

In particular, this means we can find a refinement $\mathbb{T}_1 \subset \mathbb{T}$ so that for each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_1$,

$$\Big| N_{t_0\delta^{1/2}}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T}) \Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon |N_{t_0\delta^{1/2}}(\mathcal{T})|.$$

By Theorem 3.1, this in turn implies that

$$\Big| \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T}) \Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon (t_0\delta^{1/2})^{1/2} = t_0^{1/2}\delta^{1/4}.$$

Since $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ was ε–extremal, this is a contradiction unless $t_0 \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Finally, we will refine the shadings $\{Y_2(S)\}$. By (6.4) and pigeonholing, we can select a set $A \subset \bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} Y_2(S)$ with $|A| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ so that for each $p \in A$ there is an element $S_p \in \mathcal{S}$ so that

$$|\{S \in \mathcal{S} \colon p \in Y_2(S),\ (S_p, S) \in A_{t_0}\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}.$$

For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, define the shading

$$Y(S) = \{p \in Y_2(S) \cap A \colon (S_p, S) \in A_{t_0}\}.$$

By construction, for every pair $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ and every $p \in Y(S_1) \cap Y(S_2)$, we have

$$\angle(T_pS_1,\ T_pS_2) \lessapprox_\varepsilon t_0 \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}.$$

Finally, for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}(S)$, define $Y'(\mathcal{T}) = Y_1(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y(S)$. □

In the following arguments, we will need to consider the Besicovitch set at scale δ and also at scale $\delta^{1/2}$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of regulus strips. For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, define $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S)$ to be a $\delta^{1/2}$ tube that contains S (the exact choice of $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S)$ is not important; for any two choices, one will be contained in the 100-fold dilate of the other). In what follows, we will call $\delta^{1/2}$–tubes "fat tubes," and we will call δ–tubes "thin tubes."

We can select the tubes $\{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S) \colon S \in \mathcal{S}\}$ so that after refining $\mathcal{S}$ by a factor of $O(1)$, for every pair $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ we either have that $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S_1) = \mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S_2)$ or the 100-fold dilate of $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S_1)$ does not contain $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S_2)$ and vice-versa. After performing this refinement, define

$$\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}} = \{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S) \colon S \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

This is the set of fat tubes associated to $\mathcal{S}$. In practice, the set $\mathcal{S}$ will be apparent from context.

For each fat tube $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$, define

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}) = \{S \in \mathcal{S} \colon \mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}(S) = \mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}\}.$$

This is the set of regulus strips contained in $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}$. Define

$$\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}) = \bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})} \mathbb{T}(S).$$

This is the set of thin tubes contained in $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}$.

The following lemma says that if $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$, and if $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$, then their tangent planes are parallel.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Suppose that the regulus strips in $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ have tangential intersection at angle $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$. Let $\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ be the set of fat tubes associated to $\mathcal{S}$.*

Then there is a refinement $(\mathbb{T}, Y')$ of $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ so that the following holds. For each $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ and for each $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$, if $p \in \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_1)} Y'(\mathcal{T})$ and $q \in \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_2)} Y'(\mathcal{T})$ with $\operatorname{dist}(p,q) \le \delta^{1/2}$, then

$$\angle(T_pS_1, T_qS_2) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}. \tag{6.5}$$

Proof. For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, define $Y(S) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S)} Y(\mathcal{T})$. Let $Y_1(S) \subset Y(S)$ be a refinement of the shadings with $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \chi_{Y_1(S)} \sim \mu\chi_A$ for some number $\mu \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$ and some set A with $|A| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

For each $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, define the hairbrush

$$H_{Y_1}(S_0) = \{S \in \mathcal{S} \colon Y_1(S_0) \cap Y_1(S) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Select a regulus strip $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{S\in H(S_0)} |Y_1(S)| \ge \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}|S|.$$

If the constant C_1 is chosen sufficiently large then at least one such regulus strip must exist.

For each $S \in \mathcal{S}\backslash H_{Y_1}(S_0)$ that is $\ge \delta^{C_2\varepsilon}$ separated and skew from S_0, define

$$Y_2(S) = Y_1(S) \cap \bigcup_{S'\in H(S_0)} Y_1(S').$$

If S is not $\ge \delta^{C_2\varepsilon}$ separated and skew from S_0 then define $Y_2 = \emptyset$. If the constant C_2 is chosen sufficiently large then

$$\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} |Y_2(S)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1.$$

Next, let $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$. Let $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$. Let $p \in Y_2(S_1)$, and let $\in Y_2(S_2)$ be points with $\operatorname{dist}(p,\ q) \le \delta^{1/2}$. Then there at least one regulus strip from $H(S_0)$ that intersects S_1 at the point p. This regulus strip must be contained in some tube from $\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$; call this tube $\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}$. Though there may be many regulus strips from $H(S_0)$ that intersect S_1 at p, the corresponding fat tubes containing these regulus strips will all point in the same direction up to error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. Thus up to error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$, we have that $T_p(S_1)$ is the span of the vectors $v(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$ and $v(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}})$.

Since $\operatorname{dist}(p,q) \le \delta^{1/2}$, the regulus strip in $H(S_0)$ that intersects S_2 at the point q is contained in some fat tube $\mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}$ with $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}),\ \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. Thus up to error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$, we have that $T_p(S_1)$ is the span of the vectors $v(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$ and $v(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}})$. In particular, this means that $\angle(T_p(S_1),\ T_q(S_2)) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Finally, for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}(S)$, define $Y'(\mathcal{T}) = Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y_2(S)$. □

Definition 6.3. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. We say that $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ obeys the regulus map at coarse resolution if $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ satisfies the conclusions of Lemma 6.2.*

Remark 6.1. The property of obeying the regulus map at coarse resolution is similar to the "consistency of planes and squares" property discussed in [12, Section 9]. However, the conditions under which these two properties hold are rather different.

The main consequence of Lemma 6.2 is that for each fat tube $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$, there is a well-defined regulus map $p \mapsto T_p R(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$: to compute this regulus map, select any regulus strip $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$. Then the regulus map $T_p R(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$ is simply the tangent plane $T_q S$, where $q \in S$ is a point with $\text{dist}(p, q) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. This regulus map is defined up to error $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. In particular, if $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$, then

$$\angle\big(T_p(S),\ T_p(R(T_{\delta^{1/2}}))\big) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2} \quad \text{for all } p \in \bigcup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}(S)} Y(\mathcal{T}). \tag{6.6}$$

This gives us the following analogue of Corollary 3.2, which has an identical proof:

Lemma 6.3. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Suppose that the regulus strips in $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ have tangential intersection at angle $\delta^{C_1 \varepsilon}$, and that $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ obeys the regulus map at coarse resolution. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ be $\delta^{1/2}$ tubes that are $\geq \delta^{C_2 \varepsilon}$ separated and skew.*

Then there is a regulus $R = R(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}})$ so that every tube $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfying

$$Y(\mathcal{T}) \quad \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})} Y(\mathcal{T}') \neq \emptyset, \qquad \text{and} \qquad Y(\mathcal{T}) \quad \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}})} Y(\mathcal{T}') \neq \emptyset \tag{6.7}$$

is contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of R.

Furthermore, the fat tubes from $\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ containing the tubes satisfying (6.7) intersect with multiplicity $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$—they are essentially the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of lines in the ruling of $R(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}})$.

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Lemma 6.4 (Regulus strips are $\delta^{1/2}$–separated)**.** *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Suppose that the regulus strips in $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ have tangential intersection at angle $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$, and that $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ obeys the regulus map at coarse resolution. Let $\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ be the associated set of fat tubes.*

Then there is a set $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$ with

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}'} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}(S)} |Y(\mathcal{T})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$$

so that each fat tube $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ contains at most one regulus strip from $\mathcal{S}'$.

Proof. The main idea of the proof will be that we exploit obedience to the regulus map, obtain that tubes common to three fat tubes must lie in the intersection of two thickened reguli. This will only be consistent with basic incidence counting when we have only roughly one regulus sheet per fat tube.

For each fat tube $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$, let Y' be a refinement of the shadings of the tubes in $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$ so that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})} \chi_{Y'(\mathcal{T})} \sim \mu_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}} \chi_{A_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}}$$

for some number $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}$ and some set $A_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}$. After dyadic pigeonholing and refining the set $\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ slightly, we can assume that there is number μ_{fine} so that $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}} \sim \mu_{\text{fine}}$ for each $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$. Let $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$. Let R be the regulus associated to S, and let L be a line in the ruling of R dual to the tubes of S. Thus L makes an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ with every tube in $\mathbb{T}(S)$, and L intersects that $\approx_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhood of every tube in $\mathbb{T}(S)$). Furthermore, we can choose L so that

$$|L \cap A_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2} \tag{6.8}$$

(recall that the line L intersects S in a line-segment of length roughly $\delta^{1/2}$, so (6.8) asserts that most of this intersection is contained in $A_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}$).

There are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \mu_{\text{fine}}\delta^{-1/2}$ tubes from $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$ that intersect L. Since this set of tubes obeys the Wolff axioms, and each of these tubes makes an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ with L, we can apply Lemma 3.1 to conclude that the union of these tubes has volume $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \mu_{\text{fine}}\delta^{3/2}$.

For a $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ fraction of these tubes, we have $|Y'(\mathcal{T}) \cap A_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon |\mathcal{T}| \sim \delta^2$, so

$$|A_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{3/2}\mu_{\text{fine}}.$$

We conclude that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})} |Y'(\mathcal{T})| \approx_\varepsilon \mu_{\text{fine}}|A_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \mu_{\text{fine}}^2\delta^{3/2}. \tag{6.9}$$

Since the tubes in each regulus strip $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})$ contribute $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{3/2}$ to the above sum, we conclude that

$$|\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \mu_{\text{fine}}^2. \tag{6.10}$$

Inequality (6.10) holds for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Since $|\mathcal{S}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$ and the sets $\{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})\colon \mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}\}$ are disjoint, we have that

$$|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}\mu_{\text{fine}}^{-2}. \tag{6.11}$$

For each $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$, define the hairbrush

$$H(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}) = \Big\{\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}\colon \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}})} Y'(\mathcal{T}) \ \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})} Y'(\mathcal{T}) \neq \emptyset\Big\}.$$

Next, we will count quadruples $(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}) \in (\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}})^4$ where $\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}$ are in the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}$, and where the hairbrush of $\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}$ contains few fat tubes. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q} = \big\{&(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}) \in (\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}})^4\colon \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}} \in H(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}});\\ &\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}} \text{ are } \geq \delta^{C_1\varepsilon} \text{ separated and skew;}\\ &\angle\big(v(\mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}),\ T_p(R(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}))\big) \geq \delta^{C_1\varepsilon} \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}} \cap R(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}})\big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

The constant C_1 will be chosen below.

First, if $(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}) \in \mathcal{Q}$, then there are $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ possible tubes $\mathcal{T}^*_{\delta^{1/2}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ for which $(\mathcal{T}^*_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ (the implicit constant in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon$ depends on C_1). This is because the set of fat tubes that are incident to $\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}$ and $\mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}$ intersect with multiplicity $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$, and the tube $\mathcal{T}^*_{\delta^{1/2}}$ must also intersect the set $\mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}} \cap N_{\delta^{1/2}}\big(R(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}})\big)$. The latter set is contained in a ball of radius $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Thus we have

$$|\mathcal{Q}| \leq \delta^{-\varepsilon}|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|^3. \tag{6.13}$$

Next we will compute a lower bound for $|\mathcal{Q}|$. By Remark 3.3 there are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-13/2}$ quadruples $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3) \in \mathbb{T}^4$ with $\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3)$ and $\angle(v(\mathcal{T}_3), T_pR(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \geq \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ for all points $p \in \mathcal{T}_3 \cap R(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$. We will show that this large set of quadruples of δ-tubes forces the existence of a large set of fat tubes with the same properties.

Observe that if $(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}, \mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}) \in \mathcal{Q}$, then $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-7/2}\mu_{\text{fine}}^3|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|$ of the above quadruples of thin tubes $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3)$ can satisfy

$$\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}), \quad \mathcal{T}_1 \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}), \quad \mathcal{T}_2 \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}''_{\delta^{1/2}}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_3 \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}'''_{\delta^{1/2}}).$$

To see this, note that $|\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^{1/2}})| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-2}|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|$. For each pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_1)$ with $\mathcal{T}_1 \in H(\mathcal{T})$, let $\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}$ be the fat tube containing $\mathcal{T}_1$. There are $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \mu_{\text{fine}}\delta^{-1/2}$ tubes $\mathcal{T}'_1 \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{T}'_{\delta^{1/2}}))$ that satisfy $\mathcal{T}'_1 \in H(\mathcal{T})$. Similarly for $\mathcal{T}_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_3$.

Thus

$$|\mathcal{Q}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-13/2}\Big(\delta^{-7/2}\mu_{\text{fine}}^3|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|\Big)^{-1} = \delta^{-3}\mu_{\text{fine}}^3|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|. \tag{6.14}$$

Combining (6.13) and (6.14) we obtain

$$\delta^{-3}\mu_{\text{fine}}^{-3}|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon |\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|^3,$$

so by (6.11),

$$\delta^{-3}\mu_{\text{fine}}^{-3} \lessapprox_\varepsilon |\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|^2 \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3}\mu_{\text{fine}}^{-4}$$

and thus

$$\mu_{\text{fine}} \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1, \quad |\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}. \tag{6.15}$$

This implies that each tube in $|\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}|$ contains $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ regulus strips from $\mathcal{S}$. Select one regulus strip from each fat tube and denote the resulting set of regulus strips by $\mathcal{S}'$. □

6.2 Discretization at scale $\delta^{1/2}$

Definition 6.4. *We define a "grain" to be a set G of the form $Q \cap N_{\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}}(\Pi)$, where $Q = Q(G)$ is a cube of side-length $\delta^{1/2}$ that is aligned with the grid $(\delta^{1/2}\mathbb{Z})^3$, $\Pi = \Pi(G)$ is a plane, and C is an absolute constant.*

We will choose the constant C in the above definition sufficiently large so that the following holds. Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type, and suppose that the regulus strips in $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ have tangential intersection at angle $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$. If $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\angle(v(S_1), v(S_2)) \geq \delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ and if Q is a $\delta^{1/2}$ cube with

$$Q \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_1)} Y(\mathcal{T}) \cap \bigcup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}(S_2)} Y(\mathcal{T}) \neq \emptyset,$$

then $Q \cap (S_1 \cup S_2)$ is contained in a grain.

Definition 6.5. *If $\mathcal{S}$ is a set of regulus strips and if G is a grain, define*

$$\mathcal{S}(G) = \{S \in \mathcal{S} \colon S \cap Q(G) \subset G\}.$$

Lemma 6.5. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type, and let $\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}}$ be the associated set of fat tubes. Suppose that the regulus strips in $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ have tangential intersection at angle $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$, and that at most one regulus strip $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is contained in each fat tube.*

Then there is a set $\mathcal{G}$ of grains with the following properties.

- $|\mathcal{G}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$.
- *Each $\delta^{1/2}$ cube (aligned with the $\delta^{1/2}$ grid) contains at most one grain.*
- *For each $G \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $|\mathcal{S}(G)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$.*

Proof. For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, define $Y_1(S) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}(S)} Y(\mathcal{T})$. Let $Y_2(S) \subset Y_1(S)$ be a shading with $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \chi_{Y_2(S)} \sim \mu \chi_A$ for some $\mu \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$ and some set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with $|A| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Select a strip $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ with

$$|H_{Y_2}(S_0)| \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon - 1}.$$

If the constant C is selected sufficiently large then such a regulus strip S_0 must exist. By Lemma 3.1,

$$\Big| \bigcup_{S \in H_{Y_2}(S_0)} N_{\delta^{1/2}}(S) \Big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1. \tag{6.16}$$

Since each regulus strip in the above union lies in a distinct fat tube, and since $\angle(T_p S, T_p S_0) \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ at each point $p \in S \cap S_0$, the sets in the above union have overlap $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ outside a cylinder of radius $\leq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ concentric with S_0; we will choose C sufficiently large so that for each $S \in H(S_0)$ the intersection of $Y_2(S)$ with the compliment of this cylinder still has volume $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{3/2}$.

Cover the unit ball by cubes Q of side-length $\delta^{1/2}$ aligned with the $\delta^{1/2}$ grid. For each cube Q that intersects some set of the form $Y_2(S) \backslash N_{\delta^{C\varepsilon}}(S_0)$ for some $S \in H_{Y_2}(S_0)$, let G be a grain containing $S \cap Q$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the collection of all grains of this type. By (6.16), we have that $|\mathcal{G}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$. If $G \in \mathcal{G}$ then $|\mathcal{S}(G)| \geq \mu \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$. □

6.3 Tubes and strips in parameter space

In this section, we will identify the line $(a, b, 0) + \mathbb{R}(c, d, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with the point $(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^4$.

Definition 6.6. *Let S be a regulus strip. Define $B_S \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ to be the ball of radius $\delta^{1/2}$ centered at the point (a, b, c, d) corresponding to the line coaxial with the $\delta^{1/2}$ tube containing S.*

Let G be a grain. Define

$$L_G \subset \mathbb{R}^4 = \{\ell \text{ a line in } \mathbb{R}^3 \colon \ell \cap G \neq \emptyset,\ \angle(v(\ell), \Pi(G)) \leq \delta^{1/2 - C\varepsilon}\} \cap B(0, 1).$$

The set L_G is comparable to a rectangular prism of dimensions $\approx_\varepsilon 1 \times \delta^{1/2} \times \delta^{1/2} \times \delta$. Note that if G is a grain and if S is a regulus strip with $S \cap Q(G) \subset G$, then $B_S \cap L_Q \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 6.6. *Let S be a regulus strip. Then*

$$\bigcup_{G \colon S \cap Q(G) \subset G} \{\ell \in L_G \colon \angle(v(\ell), v(S)) \geq \delta^\varepsilon\}$$

is contained in the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of a (degree 2) cone $C_S \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ whose vertex is contained in B_S. This cone is contained in the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of a hyperplane $\Sigma_S \subset \mathbb{R}^4$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ be two tubes (not necessarily from $\mathbb{T}$) that are contained in $\mathcal{S}$ and that are $\geq \delta^{\varepsilon + 1/2}$ separated. Then for each grain G with $S \cap Q(G) \subset G$ and for each line $\ell \in L_G$ with $\angle(v(\ell), v(S)) \geq \delta^\varepsilon$, we have that ℓ intersects the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhoods of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$.

Let L be the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}$ and let L' be the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}'$. Applying a rigid transformation, we can assume that L corresponds to $(1, 0, 0, 1)$, and L' corresponds to $(1 + a_0, b_0, c_0, 1 + d_0)$, where a_0, b_0, c_0, d_0 have magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$, and at least one of a_0, b_0, c_0, d_0 has magnitude $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Then the set of lines incident to both $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ correspond to points (a, b, c, d) satisfying

$$\begin{cases} |(1 - a)(1 - d) - bc| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta, \\ |((1 + a_0) - a)((1 + d_0) - d) - (b_0 - b)(c_0 - c)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta, \end{cases}$$

which can be re-arranged as

$$\begin{cases} |-d-a+ad-bc| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta, \\ |-(1+a_0)d-(1+d_0)a+b_0c+c_0b+ad-bc| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta, \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$\begin{cases} |(\delta^{-1/2}d_0,\ -\delta^{-1/2}c_0,\ -\delta^{-1/2}b_0, \delta^{-1/2}a_0)\cdot(a,b,c,d)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}, \\ |(1-a)(1-d)-bc| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta. \end{cases}$$

This set is contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of a (degree two) cone with vertex $(1,0,0,1)$ that is contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of a plane. Undoing the linear transformation, we see that the vertex of the cone is contained in B_S. □

6.4 Fourteen well-chosen points: fat tubes lie close to a quadric hypersurface

Lemma 6.7. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of $\leq \delta^{-3/2-\varepsilon}$ regulus strips, no two of which are contained in a common fat tube, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be a set of $\geq \delta^{-3/2+\varepsilon}$ grains. Suppose that each grain is contained in a distinct $\delta^{1/2}$ cube, and that $|\mathcal{S}(G)| \geq \delta^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$ for each grain $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Then there is a degree-two algebraic hypersurface $Z(P) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ and a subset $\mathcal{S}' \subset S$ of size $|\mathcal{S}'| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$ so that for each $S \in \mathcal{S}'$, B_S is contained the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of $Z(P)$.

Proof. For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, define the shading

$$Y(S) = \bigcup_{G\in\mathcal{G}:\ S\cap Q(G)\subset G} G.$$

Note that $Y(S)$ is not contained in S. However, $Y(S)$ is contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhood of S. Furthermore, $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} |Y(S)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$.

Let $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ be regulus strips that are $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ separated and skew, and let $G_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ be a grain so that S_1, S_2, and G_0 satisfy

$$|H_Y(S_1,S_2)| \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon-1/2}, \tag{6.17}$$

$$\Big|\bigcup_{S\in H_Y(S_1)} Y(S) \ \cap \bigcup_{S\in H_Y(S_2)} Y(S)\Big| \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon+1/2}, \tag{6.18}$$

and

$$\Big|\bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}(G_0)} Y(S) \ \cap \bigcup_{S\in H_Y(S_1)} Y(S) \ \cap \bigcup_{S\in H_Y(S_2)} Y(S)\Big| \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon+1}. \tag{6.19}$$

We will show that if C is selected sufficiently large then such a choice of S_1, S_2, and G_0 must exist. First, let Y_1 be a refinement of the shadings Y so that $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \chi_{Y_1}(S) \sim \mu\chi_A$ for some $\mu \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2}$ and some set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with $|A| \approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ (the set A will be a union of grains, but we won't need this fact). Select $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\big|\bigcup_{S\in H_{Y_1}(S_1)} Y_1(S)\big| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ and for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, define $Y_2(S) = Y_1(S) \cap \bigcup_{S'\in H_{Y_1}(S)} Y_1(S')$.

Now select $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $|Y_2(S_2)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{3/2}$ and $|\bigcup_{S\in H_{Y_2}(S_2)} Y_2(S)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$. The pair S_1, S_2 satisfy (6.17) and (6.18). Finally, select $G_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ that satisfies (6.19).

Next, we will consider the intersection of the (two-dimensional) cones C_{S_1} and C_{S_2}. Since these cones are contained in $\mathbb{R}^4$, in general one might suppose that they would intersect transversely. However, (6.17) asserts that if the constant C_1 is chosen sufficiently large then

$$|N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C_{S_1}) \cap N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C_{S_2}) \cap B(0,1)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{3/2}.$$

Recall that the above set is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^4$, so $|\cdot|$ denotes four-dimensional Lebesge measure; thus $\delta^{3/2}$ is precisely the measure of the $\delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of a curve in $\mathbb{R}^4$. In particular this means that the three sets

$$N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C_{S_1}) \cap N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C_{S_2}) \cap B(0,1),$$
$$N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C_{S_1}) \cap N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(\Sigma_{S_2}) \cap B(0,1),$$
$$N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C_{S_2}) \cap N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(\Sigma_{S_1}) \cap B(0,1)$$

are all essentially the same, in the sense that the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ dilate of any of these three sets contains the other two.

We shall now abuse notation slightly and replace the cone C_{S_2} by a slightly different cone C'_{S_2} satisfying $C'_{S_2} \cap B(0,1) \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C_{S_2})$ and $C_{S_2} \cap B(0,1) \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C_1\varepsilon}}(C'_{S_2})$ so that $C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ is a one-dimensional degree-two curve.

The cone C'_{S_2} is determined as follows: Let L_1 and L'_1 be lines that are $\delta^{1/2}$ separated (with error $\approx_\varepsilon 1$) that are coaxial with tubes contained in S_1. Let L_2 be a line that is coaxial with a tube contained in S_2. Then the regulus strips in the hairbrush of S_1 and S_2 are contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of the regulus R generated by L_1, L', and L_2. Let C'_{S_2} be the set of lines that are incident to L_2 and are tangent to R.

We are now ready to select our 14 points.

- Let $p_1, ..., p_5$ be five points on the conic curve $C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2}$.
- Let p_6 and p_7 be the points of intersection of L_{G_0} with C_{S_1}, C'_{S_2}, respectively.
- Let p_8 be another point on L_{G_0}.
- Let p_9 and p_{10} be the vertices of C_{S_1} and C'_{S_2}, respectively.
- Let p_{11} and p_{12}, be two points on C_{S_1}.
- Let p_{13} and p_{14} be two points on C'_{S_2}.

Let P be a polynomial of degree ≤ 2 in $\mathbb{R}[a,b,c,d]$ that vanishes on the 14 points $p_1, ..., p_{14}$. Note that there might be more than one such polynomial.

We will show that C_{S_1}, C'_{S_2}, and L_{G_0} are contained in $Z(P)$. Note that $|L_{G_0} \cap Z(P)| \geq 3$, so $L_{G_0} \subset Z(P)$. To see that $C_{S_1} \subset Z(P)$, it suffices to show that $C_{S_1} \cap Z(P)$ contains a (possibly reducible) curve of degree at least 5. First, $p_1, .., p_5$ guarantee that the curve $C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2} \subset Z(P)$, since $C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2}$ is a curve of degree two. Now, since $p_9 \subset Z(P)$, observe that if $p \in C_{S_1} \cap Z(P)$ is a point distinct from p_9 and not contained in the curve $C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2}$, then the entire line $L(p)$ connecting p_9 to p must lie in $Z(P)$. This is because if ℓ_p and ℓ_{p_9} are the lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ corresponding to the points p and p_9, respectively, then $L(p)$ corresponds to the set of lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that pass through the point $\ell_p \cap \ell_{p_9}$ and that lie in the plane spanned by these two lines. There exists a line in this set that intersects $\ell_{p_{10}}$ (the line corresponding to the vertex of C'_{S_2}). This means that $L(p)$ must intersect $C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2}$, and thus P vanishes at the three distinct points p_9, p, and $L(p) \cap C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2}$.

Therefore, since P vanishes at the points $C_{S_1} \cap L_{G_0}$, p_{11}, and p_{12}, we have that the (reducible) degree-five curve

$$\big(C_{S_1} \cap C'_{S_2}\big) \ \cup \ \big(L(C_{S_1} \cap L_{G_0})\big) \ \cup \ L(p_{11}) \ \cup \ L(p_{12})$$

is contained in $Z(P)$. This in turn implies that $C_{S_1} \subset Z(P)$. An identical argument shows that $C'_{S_2} \subset Z(P)$.

Recall that our goal is to show that most regulus strips from $\mathcal{S}$ are contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of $Z(P)$. Since C_{S_1}, C'_{S_2}, and L_{G_0} are contained in $Z(P)$, we know that the strips in $H_Y(S_1), H_Y(S_2)$, and $\mathcal{S}(G_0)$ are contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of $Z(P)$.

Before continuing, we will need two simple lemmas that control the behavior of univariate polynomials.

Lemma 6.8 (univariate polynomials have small almost-zero sets)**.** *Let $P(x)$ be a univariate polynomial of degree ≤ 2. Then for all $t > 0$,*

$$\big|\{x \in [0,1] \colon |P(x)| < t \max_{x\in[0,1]} |P(x)|\}\big| \leq \sqrt{t}.$$

Lemma 6.9. *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}[a,b,c,d]$ and let $L \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ be a line. Suppose there exist three s–separated points $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in L \cap B(0,1)$ with $\operatorname{dist}(p_i, Z(P)) < \rho$. Then for all $t \geq 1$,*

$$\big|\{p \in L \cap B(0,1) \colon d(p, Z(Q)) > t\rho\}\big| \lesssim s^3 t^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. First, observe that $W = |\nabla P|^2$ has degree 2. Let $u = \max_{p\in L\cap B(0,1)} W(p)$. Then since P has degree 2 (so $\nabla^2 Q$ is constant), $|P(p_i)| \leq 2u\rho,\ i = 1,2,3$. By Lagrange interpolation, we conclude that $|P(x)| \lesssim s^3 u\rho$ for all $p \in L \cap B(0,1)$. Furthermore, if $p \in L \cap B(0,1)$ then

$$\operatorname{dist}(p, Z(P)) \lesssim P(p)/W(p) + \delta \lesssim u\rho/W(p) + \rho$$

(the above inequality makes use of the fact that $P(p) \lesssim \rho$). Thus for $t \geq 1$,

$$\big|\{p \in L \cap B(0,1) \colon d(p, Z(P)) > t\rho\}\big| \leq \big|\{p \in L \cap B(0,1) \colon W(p) < tu\}\big| \lesssim s^3 t^{-1/2}. \quad \square$$

We are now ready to show that most of the remaining regulus strips in $\mathcal{S}$ lie close to $Z(P)$. Let $G \in \mathcal{G}$ be a grain contained in

$$B(0,1) \ \cap \bigcup_{S\in H(S_1)} Y(S) \ \cap \bigcup_{S\in H(S_2)} Y(S) \ \cap \bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}(G_0)} Y(S). \tag{6.20}$$

The above set is a union of $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-1}$ grains and is contained in the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of a plane.

Let L be a unit line segment contained in L_G. Then L passes $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$–close to $Z(P)$ at three $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon$ 1–separated points. By Lemma 6.9 with $\rho = \delta^{1/2-C\varepsilon}$, there exists a line segment $L_{\text{bad}} \subset L$ of length $\delta^{C_1\varepsilon}$ so that $(L\backslash L_{\text{bad}}) \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C_2\varepsilon}}(Z(P))$. Here C_1 is an absolute constant that we will specify later, while C_2 depends on C_1. If C_1 is chosen sufficiently large, then at most half the regulus strips $S \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ can correspond to balls $B_S \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ that intersect L_{bad}. Call a strip $S \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ "good" if $B_S \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C_2\varepsilon}}(Z(P))$. In particular, if B_S intersects $L\backslash L_{\text{bad}}$ then S is good.

Let

$$\mathcal{S}' = \bigcup_{G\subset(6.20)} \{S \in \mathcal{S}(G) \colon S \text{ is good}\}.$$

We have $|\mathcal{S}'| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$, and $B_S \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C_2\varepsilon}}(Z(P))$ for each $S \in \mathcal{S}'$.

$\square$

6.5 $Z(P)$ is $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$

In this section we will show that after applying a suitable linear transformation to $\mathbb{R}^3$, the quadric surface $Z(P)$ from Lemma 6.7 is actually $SL_2 = \{(a,b,c,d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \colon ad - bc = 1\}$.

Lemma 6.10. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a set of $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon-3/2}$ grains, each in a distinct $\delta^{1/2}$ cube, and suppose that for each grain $G \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $|\mathcal{S}(G)| \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon-1/2}$.*

Suppose furthermore that there exists a degree-two hypersurface $Z(P) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ so that $B_S \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C\varepsilon}} Z(P)$ for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Then the polynomial P is of the form

$$P(a,b,c,d) = Aa + Bb + Cc + Dd + E + F(ad-bc) + H(a,b,c,d), \tag{6.21}$$

where all of the coefficients of H have magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Proof. Let Q be a $\delta^{1/2}$ cube and let $(x,y,z) \in Q$. Then the set of all lines $\{\ell \in \mathbb{R}^3 \colon Q \cap \ell \neq \emptyset\}$ is comparable to the set

$$\{(a,b,c,d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \colon a = x + zc + O(\delta^{1/2}),\ b = y + zd + O(\delta^{1/2})\}.$$

The above set is the $\delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of a plane $\Pi_Q \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. For each grain $G \in \mathcal{G}$, the line segment L_G is contained in the $\delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of $\Pi_{Q(G)}$, and is also contained in the $\delta^{C\varepsilon+1/2}$–neighborhood of $Z(P)$.

In particular, the function

$$f_G(c,d) = P(x+zc, y+zd, c, d)$$

has magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ on the $\delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of some line in the (c,d)–plane. Since this holds for every grain $G \in \mathcal{G}$, $|\mathcal{G}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$, and the grains in $\mathcal{G}$ lie in distinct $\delta^{1/2}$ cubes, we conclude that the function

$$(c,d) \mapsto P(x+zc, y+zd, c, d)$$

has magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ on the $\delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of some line in the (c,d)–plane for $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}$ triples $(x,y,z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ that are $\geq \delta^{1/2}$ separated. This implies (6.21). □

Since the coefficients of $H(a,b,c,d)$ have magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ and at least one coefficient of P has magnitude $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$, we can replace the polynomial $Aa+Bb+Cc+Dd+E+F(ad-bc)+H(a,b,c,d)$ by the polynomial $P(a,b,c,d) = Aa+Bb+Cc+Dd+E+F(ad-bc)$; the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ neighborhoods of the zero-sets of these two polynomials are comparable.

Each linear transformation $T\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ sends lines to lines. Thus each such transformation induces a (not necessarily linear) map on $\mathbb{R}^4$, which we have identified with the parameter space of lines. The next lemmas show that after applying a suitable transformation to $\mathbb{R}^3$, the polynomial P from Lemma 6.10 has a particularly simple form.

Lemma 6.11. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Suppose that there exists a degree-two hypersurface $Z(P) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ of the form $P(a,b,c,d) = Aa+Bb+Cc+Dd+E+F(ad-bc)$ so that $B_S \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C\varepsilon}} Z(P)$ for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Then there exists a linear transformation $T\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ that distorts angles by $O(1)$ so that after applying this transformation, the image of $Z(P)$ is transformed to $Z(P')$, where $P'(a,b,c,d) = A'a + B'b + C'c + D'd + E' + F'(ad-bc)$, and $F' \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$.

Proof. First, observe that at least one of A, B, C, D, F must have magnitude $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ for some absolute constant C. We will consider several cases.

Case 1: $|F| \leq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$; $|A|, |B| \leq 2\delta^{C\varepsilon}$. If this occurs, then let Π be the span of the set of vectors

$$\{v = (c,d,1) \colon Cc + Dd + E = 0\}.$$

If $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, then $v(\mathcal{T})$ lies in the $\delta^{C\varepsilon}$ neighborhood of Π. However, since $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$ is ε–extremal, if the constant C is chosen sufficiently large then this contradicts Lemma 3.4. Thus Case 1 cannot occur.

Case 2: $F \le \delta^{C\varepsilon},\ A \ge 2\delta^{C\varepsilon}$. Apply the linear transformation

$$(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, y, z + y).$$

This sends the line $(a, b, 0) + \mathbb{R}(c, d, 1)$ to the line

$$\Big(a - \frac{bc}{1+d},\ b - \frac{bd}{1+d},\ 0\Big) + \mathbb{R}\Big(\frac{c}{1+d},\ \frac{d}{1+d},\ 1\Big).$$

Thus the variety $Z\big(Aa + Bb + Cc + Dd + E + F(ad - bc)\big)$ gets mapped to

$$\begin{aligned}
&Z\Big(A(a - \frac{bc}{1+d}) + B(b - \frac{bd}{1+d}) + C(\frac{c}{1+d}) + D(\frac{d}{1+d}) + E \\
&\quad + F\big([a - \frac{bc}{1+d}][\frac{d}{1+d}] - [b - \frac{bd}{1+d}][\frac{c}{1+d}]\big)\Big) \\
&= Z\Big(\frac{1}{1+d}\big(Aa + Bb + Cc + (D+E)d + E + (A+F)(ad - bc)\big)\Big) \\
&= Z\Big(Aa + Bb + Cc + (D+E)d + E + (A+F)(ad - bc)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

We are now in the situation where the coefficient of $ad - bc$ (namely $A + F$) has magnitude $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$.

Case 3: $F \le \delta^{C\varepsilon},\ B \ge 2\delta^{C\varepsilon}$. The argument is similar to that in Case 2, except we apply the linear transformation

$$(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, y, z + x). \quad \square$$

Lemma 6.12. *Let $(\mathbb{T} = \bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Suppose that there exists a degree-two hypersurface $Z(P) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ of the form $P(a, b, c, d) = Aa + Bb + Cc + Dd + E + F(ad - bc)$, and $F \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$.*

Then there exists a linear transformation $T\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ that distorts angles by $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ so that after applying this transformation, the image of $Z(P)$ is transformed to $Z(ad - bc - 1)$.

Proof. Define the linear transformation

$$T_1 : (x, y, z) \mapsto \Big(x - (\frac{B}{F})z - \frac{D}{F},\ \ y - (\frac{A}{F})z - \frac{C}{F},\ \ z\Big).$$

T_1 sends $Z(P)$ to $Z(P')$, with $P'(a, b, c, d) = F(ad - bc) + E'$, with $E' = 2\frac{AD-BC}{F} + E$. Since $|F| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$, this transformation distorts angles by $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$. Let $\mathbb{T}_1$ be the image of the tubes in $\mathbb{T}$ under this transformation.

Every tube in $\mathbb{T}_1$ intersects the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon |E'/F|$–neighborhood of the z axis. By Corollary 3.1, we have $|E'/F| \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$. Next, consider the transformation $(x, y, z) \mapsto (x\sqrt{E/F},\ y\sqrt{E/F}, z)$. This sends the zero-set of $Z(P')$ to $Z(ad - bc - 1)$. Since E' and F have magnitude $\approx_\varepsilon 1$, this transformation distorts angles by $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ $\square$

Lemma 6.13. *Let S be a δ^ε regulus strip with $B_S \subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C\varepsilon}}(SL_2)$, $SL_2 = Z(ad - bc - 1)$. Then the δ-tubes contained in S correspond to δ-balls in $\mathbb{R}^4$ that are contained in a rectangular prism of dimensions $\delta^{1/2} \times \delta \times \delta \times \delta$ whose major axis is $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$–transverse to SL_2.*

Proof. Let $(a,b,c,d) \in SL_2$ be a point so that the line $(a,b,0)+\mathbb{R}(c,d,1)$ is coaxial with the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of S. Recall that the set of tubes contained in S is comparable to a rectangular prism in $\mathbb{R}^4$ of dimensions $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}\times\delta\times\delta\times\delta$.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a δ–tube contained in S. Then $\mathcal{T}$ is coaxial with a line of the form $(a+u\delta^{1/2}, b+v\delta^{1/2}, 0)+\mathbb{R}(c+w\delta^{1/2}, d+x\delta^{1/2}, 1)$, where u,v,w,x have magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$.

Note that

$$(a+u\delta^{1/2})(d+x\delta^{1/2})-(b+v\delta^{1/2})(c+w\delta^{1/2}) = 1+\delta^{1/2}(ax+du-bw-cv)+O(\delta). \tag{6.22}$$

The tubes inside the regulus strip S form a one parameter family of points $(u,v,w,x)\in\mathbb{R}^4$. Our goal is to show that as the choice of tubes varies, the RHS of (6.22) varies as well.

The one parameter family of points mentioned above has the property that the intersection of the corresponding tubes with balls of radius $\delta^{1/2}$ centered at the three points $(a,b,0), (a+c/2, b+d/2, 1/2)$, and $(a+c, b+d, 1)$ must each be contained inside a rectangular prism of dimensions $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}\times\delta^{1/2}\times\delta$ (these rectangular prisms are the "grains" from Lemma 6.5). Furthermore, the normal directions of these rectangular prisms must agree with the direction dictated by the fact that all of the regulus strips lie near SL_2.

These three conditions are linear, and give us the constraints

$$-bu+av = e$$

$$-(b+\frac{1}{2}d)u+(a+\frac{1}{2}c)v-\frac{1}{2}(b+\frac{1}{2}d)w+\frac{1}{2}(a+\frac{1}{2}c)x = f,$$

and

$$-(b+d)u+(a+c)v-(b+d)w+(a+c)x = g,$$

where e, f, and g have magnitude $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$. Next we will verify that the 4×4 matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} -b & a & 0 & 0 \\ -(b+1/2d) & (a+1/2c) & -(b+1/2d) & (a+1/2c) \\ -(b+d) & a+c & -(b+d) & a+c \\ d & -c & -b & a \end{bmatrix}$$

is invertible. Indeed, the determinant is $-\frac{1}{2}(ad-bc)^2 = -\frac{1}{2}$. Thus the function

$$(u,v,x,w)\mapsto (a+\delta^{1/2}x)(d+\delta^{1/2}w)-(b+\delta^{1/2}v)(c+\delta^{1/2}x)$$

has derivative $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$ in the direction of the ruling of S. This is exactly the statement that the major axis of the $\delta^{1/2}\times\delta\times\delta\times\delta$ prism corresponding to S makes an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ with the tangent plane of SL_2 at the point of intersection. □

Lemma 6.14. *Let $(\mathbb{T}=\bigsqcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}}\mathbb{T}(S), Y)$ be an ε–extremal set of tubes of SL_2 type. Suppose that for each $S\in\mathcal{S}$, $B_S\subset N_{\delta^{1/2-C\varepsilon}}(SL_2)$.*

Then to each $S\in\mathcal{S}$ we can associate a tube $\mathcal{T}_S$ (not necessarily from $\mathbb{T}(S)$) with the following properties.

- *$\mathcal{T}_S\subset S$; in particular the tubes $\{T_S\colon S\in\mathcal{S}\}$ are $\delta^{1/2}$–separated in parameter space; i.e. no tube is contained in the $\delta^{1/2}$ neighborhood of any other tube.*
- *Each δ–tube $\mathcal{T}_S$ corresponds to a δ–ball in $\mathbb{R}^4$ that intersects SL_2.*

- *If $S, S' \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ for some grain G and if $\angle(v(S), v(S')) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$, then the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhoods of $\mathcal{T}_S$ and $\mathcal{T}_{S'}$ intersect. In particular, if we replace each tube $\mathcal{T}_S$ by its $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhood, then there are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-5/2}$ tube-tube intersections that make an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.13, for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ there is a tube contained in S (not necessarily from $\mathbb{T}(S)$, however) whose corresponding δ–ball in $\mathbb{R}^4$ intersects SL_2. Call this tube $\mathcal{T}_S$.

If S and S' make an angle $\geq \delta^{C\varepsilon}$ and share a common grain, Then every tube contained in S must intersect the $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhood of every tube contained in S' (regardless of whether these tubes are actually present in $\mathbb{T}(S)$ and $\mathbb{T}(S')$, respectively). □

6.6 Using SL_2 structure to find an impossible incidence arrangement

In this section we will use the set of tubes $\{\mathcal{T}_S\}_{S\in\mathcal{S}}$ from Lemma 6.14 to construct an arrangement of points and lines in the plane that determine many incidences.

Lemma 6.15. *Let p_1 and p_2 be points in $SL_2 \cap B(0,1)$. Suppose that p_1 and p_2 correspond to lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew. Then the line connecting p_1 and p_2 makes an angle $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ with the tangent plane of SL_2 at the point p_1.*

Proof. Let $p_i = (a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Observe that $T_{p_1}(SL_2)$ is orthogonal to the vector $(d_1, -c_1, -b_1, a_1)$. Thus we need to show that

$$|(d_1, -c_1, -b_1, a_1) \cdot (a_1 - a_2, b_1 - b_2, c_1 - c_2, d_1 - d_2)| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1.$$

But this is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &|2(a_1d_1 - b_1c_1) - (d_1a_2 - c_1b_2 - b_1c_2 + a_1d_2)| \\ &= 2 - (d_1a_2 - c_1b_2 - b_1c_2 + a_1d_2) \\ &= \begin{vmatrix} a_1 - a_2 & b_1 - b_2 \\ c_1 - c_2 & d_1 - d_2 \end{vmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

As observed in (2.6), since p_1 and p_2 correspond to lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew, the above determinant is $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$. □

Lemma 6.16. *Let $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in SL_2 \cap B(0,2)$. Suppose that p_1 and p_2 correspond to points that are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew. Let L_{p_1,p_2} be the line connecting p_1 and p_2. Then*

$$\operatorname{dist}(L, p_3) \approx_\varepsilon \operatorname{dist}(p_1, p_3). \tag{6.24}$$

Proof. Since SL_2 has degree 2 and L is a line, we have that L intersects SL_2 at precisely the points p_1 and p_2. By Lemma 6.15, $\angle(v(L), T_{p_i}(SL_2)) \gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$, $i = 1, 2$. (6.24) now follows from compactness. □

Lemma 6.17. *Let $p_i = (a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ be three points in $SL_2 \cap B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. Suppose that the lines corresponding to p_3 and each of p_1 and p_2 are $\geq \delta^\varepsilon$ separated and skew, and that*

$$\operatorname{dist}(p_1,\ p_2) \geq \delta^{1/2}. \tag{6.25}$$

Then the set of points $(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} |(a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i) \cdot (a, b, c, d) - 1| \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon},\ i = 1, 2, 3, \\ |ad - bc - 1| \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon} \end{cases} \tag{6.26}$$

is contained in a union of two balls of radius $\lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$.

Proof. First, note that if $H \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ is a hyperplane passing through the origin, then at each point $p \in H \cap SL_2 \cap B(0,1)$, the tangent planes T_pH and T_pSL_2 make an angle $\gtrsim 1$ (i.e. H and SL_2 intersect $O(1)$–transversely). Next, note that (6.26) can be written

$$|(a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1) \cdot (a, b, c, d) - 1| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta, \tag{6.27}$$

$$|(a_3, b_3, c_3, d_3) \cdot (a, b, c, d) - 1| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta, \tag{6.28}$$

$$|\delta^{-1/2}(a_1 - a_2, b_1 - b_2, c_1 - c_2, d_1 - d_2) \cdot (a, b, c, d)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}, \tag{6.29}$$

$$|ad - bc - 1| \lessapprox_\varepsilon \delta. \tag{6.30}$$

If $p = (a, b, c, d)$ satisfies (6.27) and (6.28), then p lies in the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta$ neighborhood of a plane in $\mathbb{R}^4$. If p satisfies (6.29) and (6.30), the p lies in the ($\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$) transverse intersection of the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta$–neighborhood of a non-degenerate quadric hypersurface and the $\approx_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2}$–neighborhood of a hyperplane. This hyperplane is $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ transverse to the plane given by (6.27) and (6.28). This is because by Lemma 6.16, the points p_1, p_3, and $\delta^{-1/2}(a_1 - a_2, b_1 - b_2, c_1 - c_2, d_1 - d_2)$ are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$–far from being collinear, so the corresponding hyperplanes intersect $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$–transversely. □

Corollary 6.1. *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a set of δ tubes whose corresponding δ-balls in parameter space are $\delta^{1/2}$ separated and intersect SL_2. Let $\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B \in \mathbb{T}$ be $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew. If $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in H(\mathcal{T}_A)$, then $|H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_B)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$.*

Proof. Let L_1 and L_2 be the lines coaxial with $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$, respectively. Since the tubes in $\mathbb{T}$ are $\gtrsim \delta^{1/2}$–separated, the lines L_1 and L_2 satisfy (6.25). Since $\mathcal{T}_A$ and $\mathcal{T}_B$ are $\gtrapprox 1$ skew, we can apply Lemma 6.17 and conclude that the tubes in $H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_B)$ are contained in the union of two balls of radius $\lessapprox \delta^{1/2}$. But since the tubes in $\mathbb{T}$ are $\delta^{1/2}$ separated in parameter space, this implies that $|H(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_B)| \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$. □

Lemma 6.18. *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be the set of δ–tubes whose corresponding δ-balls in parameter space are $\delta^{1/2}$ separated and intersect $SL_2 \cap B(0,1)$ (in particular, this means $|\mathbb{T}| \lesssim \delta^{-3/2}$). Suppose that*

$$|\{(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \colon \angle\big(v(\mathcal{T}_1), v(\mathcal{T}_2)\big) \geq \delta^{C\varepsilon},\ N_{\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}}(\mathcal{T}_1) \cap N_{\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}}(\mathcal{T}_2) \neq \emptyset\}| \geq \delta^{-5/2+C\varepsilon}.$$

Then there exists a set of $\delta^{1/2}$ separated points $\mathcal{P} \subset B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \delta^{-1}$ and a set $\mathcal{C}$ of algebraic curves of degree ≤ 2 with $|\mathcal{C}| \leq \delta^{-1}$. The pair $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$ has the following properties:

- *The points and curves have two degrees of freedom: If $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$ are distinct points, then*

$$|\{\gamma \in \mathcal{C} \colon \operatorname{dist}(p, \gamma) \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon},\ \operatorname{dist}(q, \gamma) \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon}\}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon 1.$$

  Note that the above bound does not depend on $\operatorname{dist}(p, q)$*!*

- *The points and curves determine many incidences:*

$$|\{(p, \gamma) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{C} \colon \operatorname{dist}(p, \gamma) \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon}\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}.$$

Proof. First, we will abuse notation slightly and replace each tube in $\mathbb{T}$ by its $\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}$ neighborhood. Select $\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B \in \mathbb{T}$ that are $\gtrapprox_\varepsilon 1$ separated and skew, and with

$$|\{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \in H(\mathcal{T}_A) \times H(\mathcal{T}_B) \colon \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}' \neq \emptyset\}| \gtrapprox_\varepsilon \delta^{-3/2}.$$

For each $\mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_A)$, let $\beta(\mathcal{T})$ be the set of points $(a,b,c,d) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ satisfying

$$(a_1, -b_1, -c_1, d_1) \cdot (a,b,c,d) = 2,$$
$$(a_2, -b_2, -c_2, d_2) \cdot (a,b,c,d) = 2,$$
$$ad - bc = 1,$$

where (a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1) is the point corresponding to $\mathcal{T}_B$ and (a_2, b_2, c_2, d_2) is the point corresponding to $\mathcal{T}$. Observe that if $(a,b,c,d) \in \beta(\mathcal{T})$, then

$$(a,b,c,d) \in SL_2, \quad \begin{vmatrix} a-a_1 & b-b_1 \\ c-c_1 & d-d_1 \end{vmatrix} = 0, \quad \begin{vmatrix} a-a_2 & b-b_2 \\ c-c_2 & d-d_2 \end{vmatrix} = 0.$$

This means that $\beta(\mathcal{T}) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ corresponds to the set of lines in SL_2 that intersect the lines coaxial with $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_B$, so $N_{\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}}(\beta(\mathcal{T}))$ corresponds to the set of lines in the $\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}$–neighborhood of SL_2 that intersect the $\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}$ neighborhoods of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_B$. By Corollary 6.1, if $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in H(\mathcal{T}_A)$ are distinct, then $\beta(\mathcal{T}_1) \cap \beta(\mathcal{T}_2)$ contains the points corresponding to $\lessapprox_\varepsilon 1$ tubes from $H(\mathcal{T}_B)$.

We can assume that at least a $\gtrsim 1$ fraction of the tubes from $H(\mathcal{T}_B)$ are contained in a set of the form $N_\delta(W)$, where

$$W \subset \{(a,b,c,d) \in SL_2 \colon (a_1, -b_1, -c_1, d_1) \cdot (a,b,c,d) = 2\}$$

is a surface patch with diameter $\leq 1/100$. Let $\pi \colon \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a projection that sends $W \to \pi(W) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with bi-Lipschitz constant $O(1)$. For each $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, define $\gamma(\mathcal{T})$ to be the Zariski closure of $\pi(\beta(\mathcal{T}) \cap W)$. This is an algebraic curve of degree ≤ 2. Define

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\gamma(\mathcal{T}) \colon \mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_A)\},$$

and define

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\pi(p(\mathcal{T})) \colon \mathcal{T} \in H(\mathcal{T}_B),\ p(\mathcal{T}) \in W\},$$

where $p(\mathcal{T}) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ is the point in $SL_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ corresponding to the line coaxial with $\mathcal{T}$. □

6.7 A planar incidence bound

In this section, we will show that the point-curve configuration constructed in the previous section cannot exist. This will conclude the proof of Proposition 6.1. We will use the discrete polynomial partitioning bound from [10]. Though the theorem works in any dimension, we will only state the planar version here

Theorem 6.1 (Discrete polynomial partitioning; [10], Theorem 4.1)**.** *Let $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a set of n points. Then for each $D \geq 1$, there is a polynomial $P(x,y)$ of degree at most D so that $\mathbb{R}^2 \backslash Z(P)$ is a union of $O(D^2)$ open connected sets (called cells), and each of these cells contains $O(n/D^2)$ points from $\mathcal{P}$.*

In addition to the points contained in each cell, some of the points may lie on set $Z(P)$, which is called the "boundary" of the partition. The following theorem will help us deal with these points.

Theorem 6.2 (Wongkew, [20])**.** *Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a real algebraic variety of codimension m whose defining polynomials have degree $\leq D$. Then there exist constants $\{C_j\}$ depending only on d so that for each $\rho > 0$,*

$$|N_\rho(V) \cap B(0,1)| \leq \sum_{j=m}^{d} c_j D^j \rho^j,$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes d-dimensional Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 6.3 (Harnack)**.** *Let $P(x,y)$ be a bivariate polynomial of degree $\leq D$. Then $Z(P)$ has $O(D^2)$ connected components.*

Corollary 6.2. *Let $P(x,y)$ be a bivariate polynomial of degree $\leq D$. Then for each $\rho > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho\big(Z(P) \cap B(0,1)\big) \lesssim D\rho^{-1} + D^2.$$

Lemma 6.19. *Let $\mathcal{P} \subset B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a set of $\leq \delta^{-1}$ points that are $\delta^{1/2}$ separated. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of $\leq \delta^{-1}$ algebraic curves of degree $\leq C_0$. Suppose that for any two points $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$, there are $\leq A$ curves $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\operatorname{dist}(p,\gamma) \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon}$, $d(q,\gamma) \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon}$. Then*

$$|\{(p,\gamma) \in \mathcal{P} \times \gamma\colon \operatorname{dist}(p,\gamma) \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon}\}| \lessapprox_\varepsilon A^{1/2}\delta^{-4/3}.$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 6.1 with $D = \delta^{-1/6}$ to the set $\mathcal{P}$, and let P be the resulting partitioning polynomial. Then $\lesssim |\mathcal{P}|D^{-2} \leq \delta^{-2/3}$ points from $\mathcal{P}$ are contained in each connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2\backslash Z(P)$. Define $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P} \cap N_{\delta^{1-C\varepsilon}}(Z(P))$, and for each connected component Ω of $\mathbb{R}^2\backslash Z(P)$, define $\mathcal{P}_\Omega = \mathcal{P} \cap \Omega\backslash\mathcal{P}_0$. By Corollary 6.2 with $\rho = \delta^{1-C\varepsilon}$, we have $|\mathcal{P}_0| \lessapprox_\varepsilon D^2\delta^{-1/2} \lesssim \delta^{-5/6}$, and $|\mathcal{P}_i| \lesssim \delta^{-2/3}$ for each index $i \geq 1$.

Let

$$\mathcal{C}_\Omega = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}\colon \gamma \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then

$$\sum_\Omega |\mathcal{C}_\Omega| \lesssim D\delta^{-1}.$$

If $\mathcal{P}'$ is a set of points and $\mathcal{C}'$ is a set of curves, define

$$I(\mathcal{P}',\ \mathcal{C}') = |\{(p,\gamma) \in \mathcal{P}' \times \mathcal{C}'\colon d(p,\gamma) \leq \delta^{1-C\varepsilon}\}|.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{C}) &= I(\mathcal{P}_0,\mathcal{C}) + \sum_\Omega I(\mathcal{P}_\Omega,\mathcal{C}_\Omega)\\
&\lesssim A^{1/2}|\mathcal{P}_0|\ |\mathcal{C}|^{1/2} + \sum_\Omega A^{1/2}|\mathcal{P}_\Omega|\ |\mathcal{C}_\Omega|^{1/2}\\
&\lessapprox_\varepsilon A^{1/2}\delta^{-4/3} + A^{1/2}\Big(\sum_\Omega |\mathcal{P}_\Omega|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(|\mathcal{C}_\Omega|\Big)^{1/2}\\
&\lesssim A^{1/2}\delta^{-4/3} + A^{1/2}(\delta^{-1}D^{-2})(\delta^{-1/2})\\
&\lesssim A^{1/2}\delta^{-4/3}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to prove Proposition 6.1. For the reader's convenience, we re-state it here.

Proposition 6.1. *There are positive constants $\alpha, \varepsilon_0, \delta_0$ so that if $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, then there cannot exist an ε–extremal collection of δ tubes of SL_2 type.*

Proof. Apply Lemma 6.18 to $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$. We obtain a set $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{C})$ that contradicts Lemma 6.19. □

7 Wrap-up

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let C be the constant from the statement of Proposition 5.1. Let $\alpha_0, \varepsilon_0, \delta_0$ be the output of Proposition 6.1 for this value of C. Apply Proposition 5.1 with this value of α, and let c_1, δ_1 be the corresponding output. Let $0 < \delta \leq \min(\delta_0, \delta_1)$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \min(\varepsilon_0, c_1\alpha_0)$.

Suppose that there exists an ε–extremal set of δ tubes; call this set $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$. Apply Lemma 4.1 to $(\mathbb{T}, Y)$, and let $\mathbb{T}_1, \mathbb{T}_2$ be the resulting sets of tubes.

By Proposition 5.1, $(\mathbb{T}_1, Y)$ cannot be ε–extremal. By Proposition 6.1, $(\mathbb{T}_2, Y)$ cannot be ε–extremal. But by Remark 4.2, at least one of $\mathbb{T}_1$ or $\mathbb{T}_2$ must be ε–extremal. This is a contradiction. We conclude that if $0 < \delta \leq \min(\delta_0, \delta_1)$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \min(\varepsilon_0, c_1\alpha_0)$, then an ε–extremal collection of δ–tubes cannot exist.

To phrase this result in the language of Theorem 1.2, let $c = \delta_0^3$ and let $C = 3/\varepsilon$. If $\delta \geq \delta_0$ or if $\lambda \leq \delta^\varepsilon$, then (1.1) is just the trivial assertion that

$$\Big| \bigcup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}} Y(\mathcal{T}) \Big| \geq \delta^3.$$

On the other hand, if $\delta \leq \delta_0$, $\lambda \geq \delta^\varepsilon$, and if inequality (1.1) failed, then this would mean there exists a ε–extremal collection of δ–tubes. As we have shown, such a collection cannot exist. □

A The SL_2 example

In this appendix we will describe some of the properties of the SL_2 example. In $\mathbb{R}^3$, the example would have the following (hypothetical) form. Let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{coarse}} \subset B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ be a set of $\delta^{-3/2}$ points $(a,b,c,d) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ that are $\delta^{1/2}$-separated and satisfy $ad - bc = 1$. Let

$$\mathbb{T}_{\text{fat}} = \{B(0,1) \cap N_{\delta^{1/2}}(L) \colon L \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{coarse}}\}.$$

This is a set of $\delta^{-3/2}$ "fat tubes" of length ~ 1 and thickness $\sim \delta^{1/2}$, each of which is contained in the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$. For each point $p \in B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, there are roughly $\delta^{-1/2}$ fat tubes from $\mathbb{T}_{\delta^{1/2}}$ passing through p, and there is a plane Π_p containing p so that each of the fat tubes containing p makes an angle $\lesssim \delta^{1/2}$ with Π_p.

We will place $\delta^{-1/2}$ δ-tubes inside each of the fat tubes. The δ-tubes will have the property that whenever two fat tubes intersect, all of the δ-tubes contained inside them also intersect. The δ-tubes inside each fat tube are contained in a regulus strip S. This strip has the property that for each $p \in S$, $\angle(T_pS,\ \Pi_p) \lesssim \delta^{1/2}$. Thus the tangent space of the regulus strip always "agrees" with the direction of the plane Π_p that is specified by the SL_2 structure of the fat tubes. In particular, this means that whenever two regulus strips (each contained in their respective fat tube) intersect, they must be tangent, and thus the intersection has large volume.

At scale δ, the union of tubes looks rather empty—the union of δ tubes has volume roughly $\delta^{1/2}$. At scale $\delta^{1/2}$. however, the union of tubes looks large: there are about $\delta^{-1/2}$ fat tubes passing through each point in the unit ball.

If we cover the unit ball by $\sim \delta^{-3/2}$ cubes of side-length $\delta^{1/2}$, then the union of the δ–tubes will intersect each of these cubes in $O(1)$ rectangular prisms of dimensions $\delta^{1/2} \times \delta^{1/2} \times \delta$ (such rectangular prisms are called grains).

A.1 Constructing the SL_2 example

While Theorem 1.2 asserts that the SL_2 example cannot exist in $\mathbb{R}^3$, it is possible to construct an analogue of the SL_2 example in a slightly different setting.

Let $R = \mathbb{F}_p[t]/(t^2)$. Note that R is not a field; not only do certain elements of R fail to have multiplicative inverses, R also also contains nilpotent elements. Thus the geometry of R^3 differs dramatically from that of $\mathbb{R}^3$. Nonetheless, it is possible to define an analogue of points, lines, and planes in R^3 that share some of the properties of their counterparts in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

We will write points $(x, y, z) \in R^3$ as $(x_1 + tx_2, y_1 + ty_2, z_1 + tz_2)$, with $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$. We define a plane in R^3 to be a set of the form

$$\{(x, y, z) \in R^3 \colon (u, v, w) \cdot (x, y, z) = s\} \tag{A.1}$$

that contains $|R|^2 = p^4$ elements. Note that not every set of the form (A.1) contains p^4 elements. For example, if $s, u, v, w \in t\mathbb{F}_p$, then the set (A.1) will contain p^5 elements.

We define a line in R^3 to be a set of the form

$$\{(a, b, 0) + s(c, d, 1) \colon s \in R\} \tag{A.2}$$

(to be slightly pedantic, we should also include lines whose directions lie in the xy plane but this will not affect our arguments). We will identify the line (A.2) with the point $(a, b, c, d) \in R^4$.

Define

$$\mathcal{L} = \{(a + \alpha at, b + \alpha bt, c + \alpha ct, d + \alpha dt) \in R^4 \colon a, b, c, d, \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p, ad - bc = 1\}.$$

This set of lines satisfies the following analogue of the Wolff axioms:

- $|\mathcal{L}| = |R|^2$.
- At most $|R|$ lines from $\mathcal{L}$ lie in any plane.
- Each pair of lines from $\mathcal{L}$ intersect in at most one point.
- If two lines intersect, then they are contained in (at least one) common plane.
- The intersection of two planes contains at most one line from $\mathcal{L}$.
- every triples of pairwise intersecting, non-concurrent lines from $\mathcal{L}$ are contained in at least (and thus exactly) one common plane.

Wolff's hairbrush argument from [17] shows that the union of any set of lines satisfying the above axioms must the above size $\gtrsim |R|^{5/2}$. On the other hand, every line in $\mathcal{L}$ is contained in

$$X = \{(x_1 + x_2 t, y_1 + y_2 t, z_1 + z_2 t) \in R^3 \colon z_2 = x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1\},$$

which has size $|R|^{5/2}$.

B Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Terry Tao for helpful comments and suggestions to an earlier version of this manuscript.

References

[1] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, T. Tao. On the Multilinear Restriction and Kakeya conjectures. *Acta Math.* 196(2): 261–302. 2006.

[2] J. Bourgain. The discretized sum-product and projection theorems. *J. d'Anal, Math.* 112(1):193–236. 2010.

[3] —. Besicovitch type maximal operators and applications to Fourier analysis. *GAFA*. 1(2): 147–187. 1991.

[4] J. Bourgain, L. Guth. Bounds on oscillatory integral operators based on multilinear estimates. *GAFA*. 21(6): 1239–1295. 2011.

[5] J. Bourgain, N. Katz, T. Tao. A sum-product estimate in finite fields, and applications. *GAFA* 14(1): 27–57, 2004.

[6] R. Davies. Some remarks on the Kakeya problem. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 69(3): 417–421. 1971.

[7] Z. Dvir. On the size of Kakeya sets in finite fields. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 22: 1093–1097. 2009.

[8] L. Guth. The endpoint case of the Bennett-Carbery-Tao multilinear Kakeya conjecture. *Acta Math.* 205(2): 263–286. 2010.

[9] —. Degree reduction and graininess for Kakeya-type sets in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 32(2): 447-494, 2016.

[10] L. Guth, N. Katz. On the Erdős distinct distance problem in the plane. *Ann. of Math.* 181, 155–190, 2015.

[11] D. Hilbert, S. Cohn-Vossen. Geometry and the Imagination. New York: Chelsea, 1999.

[12] N. Katz, I. Łaba, T. Tao. An improved bound on the Minkowski dimension of Besicovitch sets in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Ann. of Math.* 152: 383–446, 2000.

[13] N. Katz, T. Tao. Some connections between Falconers distance set conjecture and sets of Furstenburg type. *New York J. Math.*, 7: 149–187, 2001.

[14] —. Recent progress on the Kakeya conjecture. *Publ. Mat.* 46, 161–179, 2002.

[15] T. Tao. "Stickiness, Graininess, Planiness, and a Sum-Product approach to the Kakeya Problem". Blog post: https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2014/05/07/stickiness-graininess-planiness-and-a-sum-product-approach-to-the-kakeya-problem/

[16] T.Tao, V.Vu. *Additive Combinatorics*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **105**, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[17] T. Wolff. An improved bound for Kakeya type maximal functions. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 11(3): 651–674. 1995.

[18] —. A mixed norm estimate for the X-ray transform. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 14(3): 561–600. 1998.

[19] —. Recent work connected with the Kakeya problem. Prospects in mathematics (Princeton, NJ, 1996), 129–162, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.

[20] R. Wongkew. Volumes of tubular neighbourhoods of real algebraic varieties. *Pacific J. Math.* (159), 177–184, 2003.